COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume II FALL 1950 Number 4

Breton Folklore and Arthurian Romance. By Roger S. Loomis..... 289

Russian Friends and Correspondents of Sir Walter Scott. By Gleb Struve 307

A General Survey of Renaissance Petrarchism. By Ernest H. Wilkins.... 327

The Wisdom and Folly of Edward Benlowes. By Edouard Roditi..... 343

China in the *Esprit des Lois*: Montesquieu and Mgr. Foucquet. By Arnold H. Rowbotham..... 354

The Proverb: Rabelais and Cervantes. By Eleanor O'Kane..... 360

Book Reviews 370

Music and Literature, A Comparison of the Arts, by Calvin S. Brown (Bayard Q. Morgan). *An Essay on the Vita Nuova*, by Charles S. Singleton (Erich Auerbach). *Italian-American Authors and their Contributions to American Literature*, by Olga Peragallo (W.P.F.). *The Classical Tradition*, by Gilbert Highet (Frederick M. Combellack).

Books Received..... 380

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1948, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

AUSTIN WARREN
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, and with broad views of movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on broad topics and problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME II FALL 1950 NUMBER 4

BRETON FOLKLORE AND ARTHURIAN ROMANCE*

ROGER S. LOOMIS

IN 1880 the eminent Breton folklorist Luzel wrote as follows in the *Revue Celtique*:[1] "Il nous a paru digne de remarque qu'on ne trouve le nom d'aucun des héros de la Table Ronde dans la bouche de nos conteurs populaires, pas plus dans la basse que la haute Bretagne, pas même le nom d'Arthur, et qu'on ne rencontre aussi aucun souvenir des aventures et des exploits qui, quoique imaginaires presque tous, les rendaient fameux." To be sure, Luzel conceded that there were some commonplace features of romantic fiction—rescues of princesses, giants, fays, dwarfs, and so forth—to be found both in the mediaeval romances and in the modern tales of the Breton peasantry, but he went no further than to say that "une partie de tout cela peut bien être de source celtique . . . et nous venir du cycle d'Arthur, bien que nous soyons enclin à croire à une source antérieure et à une autre provenance."

This pronouncement of Luzel's represents a natural reaction against the suspicious procedures and large claims of Vicomte Hersart de la Villemarqué,[2] but also reveals a lack of familarity with the romances of the Round Table. Rendered overcautious by the fabrications and the fantasies of his compatriot, knowing too little of the history and the details of the *Matière de Bretagne*, Luzel failed to recognize in the folk tales which he collected the significant affinities between the mediaeval and the modern traditions.

We possess, of course, abundant evidence that in the twelfth century

* A French translation has been published in the *Annales de Bretagne*.

[1] *Rev. Celt.*, IV (1880), 433.

[2] F. M. Luzel, *De l'authenticité des chants du Barzaz-Breiz* (Paris, 1872).

the Bretons were familiar with the legends of Arthur and contributed to their formation. Abbé de la Rue, Stephens, Zimmer, and Brugger have established the point beyond the possibility of doubt.[3] Gaston Paris declared:[4] "C'est par les chanteurs et conteurs bretons . . . que les fictions celtiques, dépouillées en général du caractère national que la plupart d'entre elles avaient eu autrefois, pénétrèrent dans le monde roman." Bédier also, in his famous study of the Tristan legend,[5] arrived at the same conclusion: "La matière de Bretagne est le produit de la fusion des légendes armoricaines et des légendes galloises." The Modena sculpture, William of Malmesbury, Wace, and Giraldus Cambrensis combine to assure us that the diffusion of the Round Table cycle was due first of all to the professional Breton story tellers.[6]

It would be strange indeed if the traditions and tales which the Breton *conteurs* made famous in the twelfth century had left no trace in their homeland. It will be the purpose of this article to pass in review certain motifs and episodes which survive in the Arthurian manuscripts of the Middle Ages and which also survived almost to our own time among the peasants and fisherfolk of Armorica, and to determine, if possible, the nature of the relationship between the two traditions.

Of these parallels between mediaeval chivalric fiction and modern folk tales many were discovered by the great scholars of an earlier day. But I trust that I have been able to add a few others which have not been noted before, and that the sum total will be imposing.

No Breton romance made a deeper or more lasting impression on the imagination of Europe than the love story of Tristan and Iseut,[7] and it is natural that we should find reminiscences of it or even sources of it in Brittany. Near Douarnenez lies an island which since the year 1368 and perhaps earlier has borne the name of Ile Tristan.[8] Near Douarnenez also is the village of Ploumarch, and there in 1794 the following tale was told:[9]

Le roi Portzmarch faisait mourir tous ses barbiers, de peur qu'ils racontassent au public qu'il avait des oreilles de cheval. L'intime ami du roi venait le raser; il

[3] Abbé de la Rue, *Essais historiques sur les bardes, les jongleurs, et les trouvères* (Caen, 1834), I, 64-99; T. Stephens, *Literature of the Kymry* (Landovery, 1849), pp. 418-423; *Zts. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XIII (1891), 86-105; *ibid.*, XX[1] (1898), 79 ff.; *ibid.*, XLIV[2] (1922), 78 ff.

[4] G. Paris, *Littérature française au moyen âge*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1909), p. 97.

[5] Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. J. Bédier, II (Paris, 1905), 127.

[6] *Romanic Review*, XXXII (1941), 7-9, 22-28; R. S. and L. H. Loomis, *Arthurian Legends in Medieval Art* (New York, 1938), pp. 32-35; R. S. Loomis, *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes* (New York, 1949), pp. 15-20; *Mod. Phil.*, XXXIII (1936), 233-235; Wace, *Roman de Brut*, ed. I. Arnold (SATF), II, vv. 9752-53; E. K. Chambers, *Arthur of Britain* (London, 1927), pp. 102, 272.

[7] R. S. and L. H. Loomis, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 42.

[8] *Romania*, XLVI, 39 f.

[9] F. Cambry, *Voyage dans le Finistère en 1749* (Paris), II, 287.

avait juré de ne pas dire ce qu'il savait; mais ne pouvant résister à la rage de raconter ce fait, par le conseil d'un sage, il fut le dire aux sables du rivage. Trois roseaux naissent dans le lieu, les bardes en firent des hanches d haut-bois qui répétaient: Portzmarch, le roi Portzmarch a des oreilles de cheval.

Sébillot gathered two more recent versions of the same anecdote, one of which was current at Quimper, and pointed out that a stone sculpture, representing a human head with horse's ears, is preserved in the local museum.[10] This head before its removal to its present place was called by the people of the quarter "la Tête du roi March." For over a century and a half, then, the legend of King Mark and his ears has been familiar in this part of Finistère.

It is well known, of course, that Béroul, late in the twelfth century, told a similar tale of the uncle of Tristan.[11] A dwarf who is on confidential terms with Mark knows his secret, but refuses to divulge it to three inquisitive barons. He leads them, however, to a thornbush and tells the the tree that Mark has "oreilles de cheval." The barons later inform the king that his secret has leaked out, and in a rage he decapitates the culprit.

As Miss Schoepperle made clear in her classic study of the Tristan legend,[12] Béroul could not have been the source of the Breton folk tradition. A Welsh variant, quite similar to the Breton, and also attached to King Mark, was current in Carnarvonshire as early as 1693.[13] It is incredible that the Bretons and the Welsh should both have singled out this episode from Béroul and should both have added the detail that a flute made from reeds revealed the secret of King Mark's ears. Essentially the same story, moreover, is found in an Irish saga of the tenth century.[14] Though doubtless influenced, if not inspired, by the classical story of Midas, the legend of the king with horse's ears must have been current on Celtic soil and become attached to King Mark because his name meant horse. Offshoots from this legend were preserved by Béroul about 1200 and by Breton peasants as late as 1850.

It has been recognized for some fifty years that the historic original of Tristan was a certain Drust who reigned over the Picts about 780.[15] Deutschbein proved that at a very early stage a version of the widespread Perseus and Andromeda story attached itself to Drust and fur-

[10] *Revue des traditions populaires*, VII (1892), 356-359.

[11] Béroul, *Tristan*, vv. 1306-51.

[12] G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt* (London, Frankfort, 1913), II, 269-271.

[13] J. Rhys, *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx* (Oxford, 1901), I, 233-234; II, 572-573.

[14] *Ibid.*, II, 573-574; *Rev. Celt.*, II (1874), 197-199; G. Keating, *History of Ireland*, ed. Dineen, II (Irish Texts Soc., VIII), 173-175; *ibid.*, IV (I.T.S., XV), 340.

[15] Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. Bédier, II, 105-108; *Zts. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XIII[1] (1891), 69; *Comptes Rendus de l'Ac. des Inscr. et Belles Lettres* (1924), p. 128.

nished two episodes to the romances of Tristan.[16] These were, first, Tristan's victory over the champion from Ireland who demanded a human tribute, and his wounding in the fight; second, the recognition of Tristan in the bath by a foreign princess and the discomfiture of a false claimant to the hand of the princess. Thus what had been a single episode in the original story of Drust was split and elaborated as two adventures of Tristan.

The great folklorist, Sidney Hartland, showed that the Perseus and Andromeda story survived as folk tales scattered throughout Europe, and noted several versions collected in Brittany in modern times.[17] One of these Breton tales, discussed by the late Professor Van Hamel in the *Revue Celtique*,[18] may be summarized briefly as follows:

> A princess is to be sacrificed to a dragon with six heads. A boy hero undertakes to deliver her, and her father promises to give her to him if he should succeed. With the help of his horse, his dog, and a helmet, the boy severs the dragon's heads. He cuts out the tongues but leaves the heads on the spot. While he is preparing to go before the king, a hideous dwarf takes the heads and presents himself to the king as the dragon slayer and claims the princess. By the dwarf's orders the hero is refused admittance to the palace, but finally he wins the chance to present his claims. He produces the six tongues of the dragon and so wins the lady. The dwarf is hanged.

Two points are important for determining the relationship of this folk tale to the Tristan romances. We have here not two separate episodes as in the romances, but a single story. There is no trace of the recognition of the hero in the bath. These two facts render it highly improbable, if not impossible, that the Breton folk tale is derived from the Tristan romances. On the other hand, it is obvious that the romances have been influenced at some stage by the popular formula, for in the original story of Drust there was no dragon combat and no severed tongues. Just when and where these additions and alterations were made in conformity with the folk-tale formula, I am unable to say. But it may well have been in Brittany, where we have evidence that the Tristan legend had attained a vogue as early as 1000,[19] and where it certainly underwent considerable development in the next century.

Van Hamel, therefore, was right in maintaining that the modern Breton folk tales of this type were not offshoots from the Tristan romance, but on the contrary the ancestors of the folk tales had contributed at an early period to the formation of the romance. Thus, as with the tale of Mark's ears, the mediaeval courtly versions and the modern

---

[16] *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XV (1904), 16-21.

[17] S. Hartland, *Legend of Perseus* (London, 1894-96), III.

[18] *Rev. Celt.*, XLI (1924), 331-349.

[19] *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX (1924), 326-327; Pierre le Baud, *Chroniques de Vitré* (Paris, 1638), p. 5; H. Morice, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire de Bretagne* (Paris, 1742), I, 370, 372, 382, 386, 387, 408.

popular versions are cognates, both descended from or affected by narrative formulae current in Celtic territory at least as early as the twelfth century.

The motif of the black and white sails presents a more complicated problem. It is present in the classical legend of Theseus and in folk tales from Ireland, Celtic Scotland, and Brittany. *A priori,* it is unlikely that a version of the Theseus legend, accessible only in the scholiast Servius,[20] should have been incorporated in the Tristan romances; moreover, the parallel is far from close. The Irish versions also present quite a different situation from that in the romances.[21] The Scottish folk tale, as Miss Schoepperle and Dr. Brugger recognized,[22] offers more striking similarities to the Tristan story, but again the resemblance is not very strong, nor do we find instances where the Scots of the Highlands or the Hebrides derived material from Arthurian romance or contributed to it. It is the Breton version which, on the grounds of antecedent probability, is most likely to be related to the mediaeval texts. Let us turn to the *Tristrant* of Eilhart von Oberg and see how he treats the tragic conclusion.[23]

In his Breton castle, the wounded lover sends a damsel daily to the shore to watch for the coming of Iseut's ship and to report whether the sail is white or black, knowing that if it is black Iseut has not come. Tristan's jealous wife, Iseut of Brittany, learns of the scheme and persuades the girl to give her the news first. When at last Iseut's ship is sighted with a white sail, Tristan's wife lies and tells him that it is black. The sick man dies, and Iseut on her arrival expires on the body of her lover.

Compare this with the Breton tale which was current on the islands of Molène and Ouessant fifty years ago. In the words of the reporter, M. Cuillandre:[24]

Il s'agissait d'un voyage d'épreuve en pays lointain; le héros devait en revenir vainqueur avant d'épouser la fille du roi dont il était épris et qui l'aimait elle aussi. Il fut convenu entre les deux jeunes gens que si l'entreprise réussissait, le vaisseau qui ramènerait le héros porterait une voile blanche; dans le cas contraire, ce serait une voile noire. L'attente fut longue, semble-t-il. La jeune princesse languit et tomba gravement malade. Elle envoyait souvent une compagne au sommet d'une tour pour voir si quelque voile n'apparaissait pas à l'horison. Un matin une voile se montra. La malade demanda: "Noires ou blanches sont les voiles du bateau?" Sa compagne répondit que la voile était sombre comme la nuit. Et la fille du roi mourut, désespérée. Ce fut le châtiment du père qui détestait le héros et qui avait dicté la réponse à la compagne de sa fille.

---

[20] Thomas, *Tristan,* ed. Bédier, II, 137-140.

[21] Schoepperle, *op. cit.,* II; 438; *Rev. Celt.,* XXXII (1911), 184-193.

[22] Schoepperle, *op. cit.,* II, 438, note 2; *Archiv f. d. Studium d. Neueren Sprachen,* CXXX (1913), 132-136.

[23] Schoepperle, *op. cit.,* I, 62-63; Eilhart von Oberge, ed. F. Lichtenstein, *Quellen u. Forschungen,* XIX (1877), vv. 9256-391.

[24] *Rev. Celt.,* XXXVII (1917-19), 323.

There is, of course, one marked difference between this tale and Eilhart's narrative. It is a woman, not a man, who meets her death on hearing of the black sail. Otherwise this is the closest analogue we have to the tragic ending of Tristan—the colors of the sails, the woman sent to report the arrival of the ship, the hatred which inspired her lie, all these features correspond. Moreover, this tale was current on islands not far from the Ile Tristan; and the islands are too remote from bookish centers to have derived their traditions from mediaeval romances. Are we not justified in concluding either that this folk tale of the black and white sails was current independently on Breton soil as early as the twelfth century and was used by Breton *conteurs* to furnish a dramatic ending to the love story, or that it is a fragmentary and distorted survival of the *conteurs'* story? At any rate, it could not have been derived from the French source of Eilhart.

To recapitulate, three elements in the history of Tristan are paralleled in the folklore of Lower Brittany, two of them being popular on the west coast not far from the Ile Tristan, and one of these being attached to King Mark. There can be no doubt that there is a relationship between the mediaeval literary forms and the modern oral forms. But it has been demonstrated that the folk-tale versions of Mark's ears and of the dragon slayer could not have been extracted from any extant version of the Tristan romance, and it is not very likely that this was the case with the formula of the black and white sails. The only reasonable inference is, then, that the folk tales are derived from lost oral forms of the romance, or that the Breton reciters of the eleventh and twelfth centuries wove piquant and dramatic situations from current popular fiction into their longer narratives. When we realize that all three of these formulae have their analogues in famous legends of antiquity, in the stories of Midas, Perseus, and Theseus, it does not seem astonishing that they should have lived on the lips of Breton peasants and fishermen for eight or nine hundred years.

Since we have observed that the motif of the black and white sails was well known in the islands of Molène and Ouessant two generations ago, let us turn our attention to a belief which dominated the imagination of their inhabitants, a belief in sea fairies known as Morgans. The following legend, reported by M. Cuillandre from the Ile Molène early in this century, has been translated into English:[25]

> The Morgan is a fairy eternally young, a virgin seductress whose passion, never satisfied, drives her to despair. Her place of abode is beneath the sea; there she possesses marvellous palaces where gold and diamonds glimmer. Accompanied by other fairies, of whom she is in some respects the queen, she rises to the surface

[25] W.Y.E. Wentz, *Fairy-Faith in Celtic Countries* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 200-201; see *Annales de Bretagne*, XXXV (1921-23), 634.

of the waters in the splendor of her unveiled beauty . . . By moonlight she moans as she combs her fair hair with a comb of fine gold, and she sings in a harmonious voice a plaintive melody whose charm is irresistible. The sailor who listens to it feels himself drawn toward her . . . But the arms of the fairy clasp only a corpse; for at her touch men die, and it is this which causes the despair of the amorous and inviolate Morgan.

Since the name Morgan is properly masculine, the name Mari is often prefixed to indicate the sex of these fairies. Sébillot wrote in 1905:[26]

Lorsque les marins de Basse-Bretagne avaient cédé à la séduction des Mari Morgan, ils arrivaient aussi dans un palais de nacre et de cristal, où les attendaient des plaisirs de toutes sortes. Ils épousaient la Mari Morgan qui les avait enlevés, et si l'espoir de reprendre leur place parmi les hommes leur était interdit, ils finissaient par ne pas trop s'en plaindre. Riches, choyés, servis à souhait, ils vivaient heureux, grassement, et avaient beaucoup d'enfants.

Souvestre gave over a hundred years ago a similar account of a Mari Morgan who haunted, not the seashore, but a pond near Vannes:[27]

Une mary-morgan habite l'étang du duc, près de Vannes, elle en sort quelquefois pour tresser au soleil ses cheveux verts. Un soldat l'a surprise un jour sur son rocher, et, attiré par sa beauté, il s'approcha d'elle; mais la mary-morgan l'enlaça de ses bras et l'entraina au fond de l'étang.

Though Souvestre does not say so, the soldier doubtless lived with his fairy mistress in her watery home. We shall later have reason to question the good faith of Souvestre as a reporter of folk tales, but in this instance his testimony is supported by too many other witnesses to be put aside.

The Morgans, then, possess two constant characteristics—their aquatic abode, whether salt water or fresh, and their amorous propensities. It can hardly be a coincidence that these are precisely the two outstanding characteristics of Morgain la Fée in mediaeval literature. Geoffrey of Monmouth and Etienne de Rouen both call her a *nympha*;[28] in *Floriant et Florete* she is one of "trois fées de la mer salée";[29] Hartmann von Aue says she could live above and under the waves;[30] the Provençal romance of *Jaufré* relates that the hero was pushed into a spring by a maiden who leapt in after him, clasped him to her, and the two descended to her lovely land at the bottom.[31]

It is obvious that Jaufré and the soldier of Vannes had the same

[26] P. Sébillot, *Folk-lore de France* (Paris) II, 36.

[27] E. Souvestre, *Les derniers Bretons* (1843), p. 111.

[28] E. Faral, *Légende arthurienne* (Paris, 1929), p. 340, v. 1124; p. 334, vv. 916-31; *Mod. Phil.*, XXXVIII (1941), 290.

[29] *Floriant et Florete*, ed. F. Michel (Edinburgh, 1873); ed. Harry F. Williams (Ann Arbor, 1947), vv. 549-53.

[30] Hartmann von Aue, *Erek*[2], ed. M. Haupt (Leipzig, 1871), vv. 5177-9.

[31] *Jaufré*, ed. H. Breuer (Göttingen, 1925), vv. 8378-435, 8743-6.

supernatural experience with the same supernatural female. One was drawn to the bottom of a spring in the arms of "la fada del Gibel," that is, Morgain la Fée.[32] The other was drawn to the bottom of a pool in the arms of a fay, Mary Morgan. Here, then, is one marked correspondence between the sirens of Breton folklore and the notorious enchantress of the *matière de Bretagne*.

Another marked similarity lies in their amorous natures. Morgain la Fée had a number of lovers: Guiomar, Floriant, Ogier le Danois, Renoart, Breus.[33] She also offered her favors, in vain, to Lancelot, Alisandre l'Orphelin, Tristan, and Hector of Troy![34] Here we have a second trait common to a fairy queen of Arthurian romance and the Morgans of modern Brittany. Thus the curiously masculine name, the sex, the haunting of waters both salt and fresh, the land beneath the waves, the seduction of human lovers—all tend to assert the original identity of Morgain la Fée with the fairies of yesterday. And, in view of its inherent probability, the hypothesis may well be accepted.

One may also recognize the humble relations of the mediaeval Morgain in the fairies of the Côtes-du-Nord who dwell in caverns by the sea or in rock shelters near a pond or stream. They are called Margot la Fée, apparently because the female name Margot seemed more appropriate than the masculine Morgan. Their relationship to the fairy queen of the romances is rendered probable by the remarkable parallel between a folk tale about Margot la Fée, published by Sébillot in 1882,[35] and an Arthurian story—a parallel to which Miss Paton drew attention almost fifty years ago.[36]

> Une Margot la Fée, dont la fille est à un certain jour de l'année metamorphosée en couleuvre, prie un paysan d'aller sur la route et de couvrir avec un bassin la couleuvre qu'il trouvera, à l'endroit désigné; il y va et reste assis sur le bassin jusqu'au soir; alors il le lève, et au lieu d'une couleuvre, il voit une belle jeune fille qui le récompense magnifiquement.

As Miss Paton pointed out, a similar story is told in an Italian *cantare* of the fourteenth century, *La Pulzella Gaia*.[37]

> Galvano (i.e. Gawain) was worsted in a fight with a horrible serpent, but when he revealed his name, the serpent turned into a beautiful maiden. She said that she was the daughter of la Fata Morgana, and had long desired him for her lover. To this proposal Galvano consented and received from his faery mistress a ring which

[32] *Ibid.*, vv. 10651-4; L. A. Paton, *Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance* (Boston, 1903), p. 150.

[33] Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 50, 61-62, 74-80; *Floriant et Florete*, vv. 2523-4; E. Löseth, *Roman de Tristan en prose* (Paris, 1891), par. 118, 291a, 292a, 611.

[34] *Speculum*, XX (1945), 183-186; Löseth, *op. cit.*, par. 190-192.

[35] Sébillot, *Traditions et superstitions de la Haute Bretagne* (Paris, 1882), p. 109.

[36] Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 100, note 7.

[37] Ezio Levi, *Fiore di leggende* (Bari, 1914), pp. 31-58.

brought him whatever he wished. But after a while he disobeyed her command, and she returned to her mother, Morgana, who transformed her from the waist down into a fish and placed her in a tower, waist-high in water. Galvano, after a long search, obtained access to the tower, delivered his mistress from her aqueous fate, and substituted Morgan in her place. The lovers then returned happily to Camelot.

It cannot be mere coincidence that in the Breton tale we have the daughter of Margot la Fée, transformed into serpent shape and delivered by a man who was well rewarded for his deed, while in the Arthurian poem we have a daughter of Morgain la Fée, transformed into a serpent and delivered by a knight who received from her a wishing ring. If it be suspected that the Italian story is a mere invention, the contrary is proved by the fact that the elements are found, somewhat distorted and reshuffled, in the *Vulgate Lancelot*.[38] There we read that Gauvain came to a tower, entered, and discovered a maiden suffering great anguish in a marble vat of scalding water. He failed in his effort to lift her out and departed. Later Lancelot came to the same tower and succeeded in releasing her from her enchantment. It is at least a startling fact that Malory in retelling Lancelot's feat (as incorporated in certain manuscripts of the *Prose Tristan*) states that the enchantment was the work of Morgain la Fée.[39] Both the French and the English versions go on to say that, immediately after the exploit, Lancelot lifted the lid of a tomb and killed a serpent which issued from it.

In this whole group of stories recorded in the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth centuries, we have a medley of several of the same elements: Morgain or Margot, fay or enchantress; her daughter metamorphosed into a serpent; the combat of a hero with a serpent; the deliverance of the daughter of Morgain or Margot. It is an odd fact that the Breton version of the nineteenth century comes closer to the Italian version of the fourteenth than to any other.

This connection between the mediaeval and modern fays finds still another support. One François Mallet of Gouray told Sébillot in 1880 that the Margots were wont to give names to infants, especially those of noble houses, bestowed gifts on them, and predicted what they would become.[40] This is exactly the same power which the mediaeval texts attribute to Morgain la Fée. At midnight, after the birth of Floriant, three fays of the salt sea arrived, the mistress of whom was the renowned sister of Arthur.[41] She proclaimed that the child would be "a good knight, the boldest, fiercest, wisest, and best mannered." She and

[38] H. O. Sommer, *Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, IV, 342; V, 106.
[39] T. Malory, *Works*, ed. E. Vinaver (Oxford, 1947), II, 791-793.
[40] Sébillot, *Traditions et superstitions*, p. 110.
[41] See *supra*, note 29.

her companions then transported him to her abode of Mongibel. Likewise, according to a romance of the fourteenth century, six fays appeared at the birth of Ogier le Danois and conferred various gifts on him.[42] Morgain, the last, foretold that, after a long and glorious career, the hero would come to dwell with her in Avalon. A similar account of Arthur himself is furnished by the English poet Layamon about 1200; and, though Morgain herself is not named at this point, we read later of a fay, Argane or Argante, who conveyed the wounded Arthur to Avalon.[43] Furthermore, it is a significant fact that Layamon implies clearly that the king's youth was passed in Little Britain,[44] the land of the Morgans.

The influence of the Breton fancy on the fairy world of the Arthurian romances can also be traced in the episode of the illuminated tree, related by Wauchier de Denain in his continuation of the *Conte del Graal*.[45]

> After Perceval's adventure at the Mont Douloureux, he rode all afternoon in a tempest of thunder and lightning. But, when night came on, the weather cleared and the moon and stars glittered in the sky. He saw before him a large tree, covered with a thousand candles. As he drew near, the tree seemed to catch fire. But suddenly the candles and the tree were extinguished and darkness reigned. When he came to the spot, he found no candle, light, or living thing.

Wauchier himself offers no explanation of this marvel; but in Manessier's continuation the Fisher King declares that it is the tree of enchantment, where fays gathered, that Perceval's approach had put them to flight forever, and that neither tree nor candles would ever be seen again.[46] The analogous incident in *Durmart le Gallois* is contaminated by a foreign element, the mysterious child in the tree, and the adventure receives a theological interpretation.[47] Wauchier's version is surely the more natural and primitive.

Miss Weston, Professor Peebles, and Dr. Brugger have discussed these episodes,[48] and Professor Panzer has more recently pointed out

[42] Le Roux de Lincy, *Livre des légendes* (Paris, 1836), pp. 178-179.

[43] Layamon, *Brut*, ed. F. Madden (London, 1847), II, 384, 546; III, 144. See C. Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois* (Mons, 1866-71), V, 123-124; *Mervelles de Rigomer*, ed. W. Foerster, H. Breuer (Dresden, 1908), vv. 9403-6; *History of the Valiant Knight Arthur of Little Britain*, ed. E. V. Utterson (London, 1814), pp. 44-47; Raynouard, *Lexique roman* (Paris, 1840), III, 282a; L. Gautier, *Epopée française*, IV, 111; Robert of Brunne, *Handlyng Synne*, ed. Furnivall (London, 1901), I, 21; R. Pecock, *Repressor of Over Much Blaming of Clergy*, ed. C. Babington (London, 1860), p. 155; *Germanic Review*, XIX (1944), 128-129.

[44] Layamon, *Brut*, II, 408-412.

[45] Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois*, IV, vv. 34414-32.

[46] *Ibid.*, IV, vv. 35366-87.

[47] *Durmart*, ed. E. Stengel (Tübingen, 1873), vv. 15559 ff., 15817 ff.; E. Brugger, *Illuminated Tree in Two Arthurian Romances* (New York, 1929), pp. 19-24.

[48] Brugger, *op. cit.*; *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, IX (1925); *Medieval Studies in Memory of G. Schoepperle Loomis* (New York, Paris, 1927), pp. 285-299.

the right solution.[49] The quest leads us, this once, not to a modern analogue but to a natural phenomenon which has been observed in Brittany in modern times and which, of course, could have been observed there in any age. *La Grande Encyclopédie* asserts that "le feu de Saint Elme se manifeste souvent ailleurs que sur mer, par exemple aux sommets des toits and des arbres."[50] Canon Mahé wrote in his *Essais sur les Antiquités de Morbihan*:[51] "Tantôt les arbres, tout en feu au milieu de la nuit paraissaient former un vaste incendie, et à cet éclat fantastique succédait une obscurité profonde qui faisait frissonner." Especially interesting and pertinent is the testimony of Miorcec de Kerdanet, writing in 1837:[52] "... de ces solitudes impénétrables, la nuit fuyait et, sans se consumer, les arbres devenaient autant de flambeaux ...; mais bientôt tout s'éteignait, et une obscurité plus terrible encore ressaisissait la forêt mystérieuse."

Here is an experience almost identical with that of Perceval. Naturally the peasants of the Middle Ages interpreted it as the work of fays, just as the Fisher King does. Once more it seems that a romantic scene of the Arthurian cycle found its inspiration in the fantasies of the mediaeval Bretons.

Long-recognized and incontestable connection between the mediaeval cycle and the customs formerly prevailing among the Armorican peasantry is to be found in the famous series of scenes at the storm-making fountain which Chrétien describes in *Yvain*. It is needless to recall the details. Suffice it to say that first Calogrenant, then Yvain, and still later Arthur approached the spring beneath the pine in the forest of Broceliande, poured water upon a block of stone near by, and produced at once a heavy storm of rain. Chrétien's contemporary, Wace, is the first witness to the general belief in the magic virtues of this spring, telling us in his *Roman de Rou* (1160-74) how huntsmen in time of drought used to visit the fountain of Berenton, dip up water from it in their horns, wet the stone near by, and so bring on rain.[53] We have unimpeachable testimony to the practice in a series of mediaeval writers, Giraldus Cambrensis, Guillaume le Breton, Thomas of Cantimpré, and a document of 1467 describing the customs of the forest of Broceliande.[54] Finally we have a record that in 1835 after a

[49] *Sitzungsberichte d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, ph.-hist. Kl. (1940), pp. 29-30.

[50] *Grande Encyclopédie*, XVII, 366b.

[51] J. Mahé, *Essais sur les antiquités de Morbihan* (Vannes, 1825), p. 426.

[52] D. Miorec de Kerdanet, ed., *Vies des saints de la Bretagne armorique*, par Fr. Albert Le Grand (Brest, 1837), "Vie de S. Salomon," p. 360. See F. Bellamy, *La Forêt de Bréchéliant* (Rennes, 1896), pp. 47-48.

[53] Wace, *Roman de Rou*, ed. H. Andresen (Heilbronn, 1879), II, 283-284.

[54] *Beihefte zur Zts. f. romanische Phil.*, LXX (1921), 139-142; W. Foerster, *Kristian von Troyes, Wörterbuch* (Halle, 1914), 99*-103*.

long drought a curé of Concoret led a procession to the spring, dipped an aspergill in the water, and sprinkled the *perron*.[55]

Can anyone seriously believe that it was Chrétien's poem which gave rise to this popular custom of seeking relief from drought at the fountain? That would be the reverse of the common relationship. Frequently in literary history a Theocritus, a Virgil, a Shakespeare draws his materials from folk ritual or folk custom. Never, unless I am much mistaken, does a literary genius imagine such a practice and succeed in imposing it on country people who cannot read. Wace himself affirmed that the forest of Broceliande furnished the subject of Breton tales,[56] and doubtless there was a tradition of the rain-making spring of Berenton. Once more, then, we find a Breton legend of local currency, incorporated in a twelfth-century romance, which has survived independently into the nineteenth among the peasantry.

Let us continue our comparisons. Luzel collected a folk tale in 1874 which tells how a young man crossed the sea, arrived at an island where orange trees abounded, and in this evidently southern land came upon a dwarf and his two giant brothers, who dwelt in a crystal palace.[57] One cannot but be reminded that Chrétien introduces us in *Erec* to the dwarf Bilis, king of the Antipodes, and to his brother, the giant Brien.[58] This pair, Bilis and Brien, appear somewhat disguised throughout the Round Table cycle[59]—and here is another appearance in a modern Breton fairy tale.

From Carnac there comes a macabre story of a seamstress who, passing one evening through a cemetery, saw on a grave a new white cloth.[60] Yielding to temptation, she cut off a piece, returned home, and on the following night was working on the stolen cloth when a spectral man entered and threatened her with death unless she replaced it. She hurried back to the cemetery and sewed the stolen piece of cloth to the remaining portion. As soon as she had done this, the whole was whisked away and disappeared into the night.

Every student of Arthurian romance must have been struck by the considerable number of scenes laid in cemeteries; Mrs. Laura Hibbard Loomis has shown that one of them was of Irish origin.[61] Several deal with the theme of a woman who enters a perilous cemetery and brings

[55] Hersart de la Villemarqué, *Romans de la Table Ronde*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1860), p. 235.

[56] Wace, *op. cit.*, II, vv. 6395-6.

[57] F. M. Luzel, *Contes populaires de Basse-Bretagne* (Paris, 1887), I, 244-245.

[58] *Erec*, vv. 1993-9.

[59] *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 920-924; R. S. Loomis, *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*, chap. XX, LX, LXXV; H. Newstead, *Bran the Blessed in Arthurian Romance* (New York, 1939), pp. 75-76, 164-167.

[60] W. B. Johnson, *Folktales of Brittany* (London, 1927), pp. 133-134.

[61] *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, XXVI (1931), 408-426.

away a cloth. Two versions are found in *Perlesvaus* and *Le Chevalier aux Deux Epées*; both form no integral part of the plot, and the motivation of the characters is fantastic, even absurd. The *Perlesvaus* incident runs as follows:[62]

> The sister of the hero made a vow to obtain from "l'Aitre Périlleus" a piece of the cloth in which Christ's body was wrapped for burial. Riding a mule, she entered the cemetery after dark alone. The graveyard was hallowed, but outside the ghosts of knights who had been buried outside the sacred precincts fought with each other and made a great uproar. The damsel came to a chapel, alighted, and found the most holy cloth above the altar; but when she was about to take it, it rose into the air. When she had prayed, the cloth descended upon the altar and a part of it separated itself, and this she placed in her bosom. At dawn the damsel departed from the burial ground, and on returning to her mother's castle, gave the holy cloth to her brother Perlesvaus to aid him in recovering his patrimony.

The irrationality of this adventure is patent. The explanations explain nothing. Why is the holy shroud found in a remote and mysterious chapel in Britain? Why should it serve the territorial pretensions, however just, of a Welsh prince? Why does the dangerous task of procuring it devolve on a maiden? It is obvious that the motivation is artificial, superimposed on a pre-existing narrative. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the parallel episode in *Le Chevalier aux Deux Epées* furnishes an entirely different motivation but equally irrational and forced.[63] In this poem it is the Lady of Caradigan who was obliged to seek in a waste chapel a part of a surcoat which the king of Outre-Ombre had left on the altar. It seems clear, then, that we have to do with a formula of which the original meaning has been lost. Nevertheless, the situation was thrilling and dramatic. The mediaeval author, like the peasant of yesterday, could inject into it such sense as he pleased, and the sense did not need to be very realistic, considering that the events were laid in the notoriously fantastic days of King Arthur. The tale of the seamstress of Carnac is but the most recent offshoot of the old wild *conte* which was employed by the romancers.

Let us observe that, in all the cases we have considered, the modern folk tale is not linked to personages of the Arthurian circle—except those which are concerned with the Morgans or King Mark, and even these are not derived from the mediaeval versions. All the evidence shows that the mediaeval Breton *conteurs* drew from the great reservoir of contemporary popular traditions many of the most striking elements of their narrative repertory. This is the reason that one could hear in the last century from the lips of rustics and fishermen essentially the same tales which one can read in the French and Anglo-Norman texts of the Middle Ages.

---

[62] *Perlesvaus*, ed. W. A. Nitze and T. A. Jenkins (Chicago, 1932-37), I, 220-233. See *ibid.*, II, 306-309; Malory, *Works*, ed. Vinaver, I, 279-282; III, 1414-5.

[63] *Chevaliers as Deus Espees*, ed. W. Foerster (Halle, 1877), vv. 441-993.

But there is a fairy tale, told to Luzel in 1855, which contains a situation which, so far as I am aware, does not belong to the common stock of European folklore and which cannot be traced to any other source than to a developed romance of the Grail. The hero of this tale by chance encounters an old man, his uncle, who dwells in the depths of a forest and who has subsisted for twenty years on a crust of bread.[64] One inevitably recalls the famous scene described by Chrétien where Perceval comes by chance to the hermitage of his uncle, who informs him that another uncle of his, the unseen invalid of the Grail Castle, has subsisted for twenty years (the number is supplied by four manuscripts) on the eucharistic bread.[65] I have attempted in my book, *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*,[66] to show that this scene represents a fairly complicated and late development in the ancient legend of the Grail. Unless I am mistaken, therefore, this meager detail in the modern story is the only certain example in Breton folklore of a borrowing from the vast literature of Arthur.

But it may be objected that the tale of *Perronik*, which Souvestre published in 1845, professedly from the recitation of a maker of sabots in the neighborhood of Vannes, presents a much more striking and extended parallel to Chrétien's poem. Unfortunately the authenticity of *Perronik* is suspect and scholars have debated at intervals over a century the problem of its nature. Is it a true descendant by oral transmission of a Celtic tale of Perceval, as Souvestre maintained, or is it an artificial concoction by Souvestre himself? Let me summarize the story, which occupies thirty-four pages.[67]

Perronik was one of those poor halfwits for whom the charity of Christians takes the place of father and mother. One day, coming to a farmhouse, he found the housewife alone and asked for food. He persuaded her by his flatteries to give him an ample meal. A horseman approached and inquired the road which led to the castle of Kerglas, where the *bassin* of gold and the diamond lance were kept at the bottom of a vault. "The *bassin* of gold," he said, "produces at once the food and the wealth one desires; one has only to drink to be healed of one's ills; and even the dead come to life if it touches their lips. The diamond lance kills and breaks whatever it strikes." The farm woman warned the cavalier that more than a hundred other gentlemen had already passed in search of the *bassin* and the lance, but none had returned. The cavalier, however, continued on his way; and Perronik, for his part, was employed at the farm as a herdboy. In the course of time many cavaliers passed in quest of the castle of Kerglas, but none came back. One evening an old, white-bearded man came out from a forest, approached Perronik, and revealed he was a sorcerer of the giant Rogéar, who possessed the *bassin* and lance. From this ancient Perronik learned the charm by which he

[64] Luzel, *Contes populaires de Basse-Bretagne*, I, 179.

[65] *Perceval roman*, ed. A. Hilka (Halle, 1932), vv. 6338-431.

[66] *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes*, chap. LXXV.

[67] E. Souvestre, *Le Foyer breton* (Paris, 1864), pp. 137-170; *ibid.* (Paris, 1947), pp. 257-274.

could catch a colt belonging to Rogéar. So, one day, mounted on this colt, the herdboy set out for the giant's castle and succeeded by his smartness in overcoming the perils of the journey. These perils included trees which seemed to blaze, a garden watched by a ferocious lion, a lake of dragons, and a valley guarded by a black man. When Perronik came in sight of Kerglas, he met, seated near a ford, a woman in a black robe with a body yellow as that of a Moor. He set her on the crupper of his colt, crossed the ford, and, following her instructions, entered the castle, killed Rogéar, and won the *bassin* and lance. Then he went to the court of the king of Brittany at Nantes, defeated the French, and revived the dead Breton soldiers by touching their lips with the *bassin*. After conquering the rest of France, he journeyed to the Holy Land, forced the emperor of the Saracens to be baptized, and married his daughter.

Let us see, now, what Souvestre wrote concerning the relation of this naive tale to the mediaeval Perceval and Peredur romances.[68]

Les rapports d'origine qui existent entre ce poème [the *Conte del Graal*] et le conte breton ne sont point, à ce qu'il nous semble, difficiles à saisir. Dans les deux récits il s'agit de la conquête d'un bassin et d'une lance dont la possession assure des avantages du même genre; les héros de la version française et de la version armoricaine sont soumis à des dangers, à des tentations, et la réussite leur assure à tous deux la couronne. On pourrait même peut-être trouver quelques rapports de personnage entre l'idiot Perronik allant devant lui sans savoir où, et arrachant à la fermière son pain de méteil, son beurre frais baratté, son lard de dimanche, et ce Perceval simple, ignorant, grossier, qui débute par dévorer deux pâtés de chevreuil et boire un grand pot de vin. A la vérité, les détails diffèrent et les épreuves subies par Perronik ne ressemblent point, en général, aux épreuves imposées à Perceval; mais, en revanche, elles rappellent, de fort près, celles que surmonte Peredur, le héros de la tradition galloise. Il semble donc que le conte armoricain a puisé successivement aux deux sources française et bretonne. Né de la tradition galloise, modifié par la version française, et enfin approprié au génie populaire de notre province, il est devenu, en s'altérant par une suite de transmissions, ce que nous le voyons aujourd'hui.

What are the arguments in favor of the authenticity of *Perronik?* First, the story has a completely rustic flavor; it seems to be the creation of the folk imagination, not an artificial product of the age of Louis-Philippe. Second, if it is a forgery, the author must have been inconceivably clever in restricting or disguising his borrowings from the mediaeval romances. Except for Perronik-Perceval, the proper names bear no resemblance to each other. The sacred associations of the Grail and the lance which are emphasized in the French poem are totally absent from *Perronik*. The Fisher King and the giant Rogéar have nothing in common except the possession of the vessel and lance. Third—and this is an argument which weighed heavily with me—the properties of the two talismans possessed by Rogéar are not at all those attributed to the objects guarded by the Fisher King nor those of the dish and lance in *Peredur*; but they are almost identical with the properties attached in a Welsh list of the fifteenth century to the vessel and the sword of Rhyd-

[68] Souvestre, *Foyer breton* (1864), p. 177; (1947), p. 279.

derch. The *bassin* of gold described by Souvestre "produces at once the food and the wealth one desires." As for the dish (*dysgl*) of Rhydderch in the Welsh list, "whatever food was wished thereon was instantly obtained."[69] The diamond lance described by Souvestre "shone like a flame." In the Welsh list there is no lance, indeed, but the sword of Rhydderch; "if anyone except its owner drew it from the sheath, the sword seemed like a flame in his hand."[70] If Souvestre did not know this Welsh document, how can one account for the correspondence with *Perronik* except through a traditional link? Such a parallelism can hardly be fortuitous. These three considerations seem to assure the authenticity of *Perronik*.

On the other hand, there are certain facts which warrant suspicion. If Souvestre had wished to fabricate a Breton folk tale, he had the necessary qualifications to write a good imitation. *Les Derniers Bretons*, which he had published in 1835, demonstrates his remarkable familiarity with the traditions current among the country folk of his time; his vast production of novels and plays demonstrates his talent for shaping the materials provided by what he had seen and heard. Moreover, it is embarrassing that no one but Souvestre seems to have heard from the lips of the humble a word about Perronik "l'idiot," or the *bassin* of gold, or the diamond lance.

The most formidable argument against the genuineness of the tale is the fact that we can discover in *Les Contes populaires des anciens Bretons* by Vicomte Hersart de la Villemarqué a considerable number of the special features of the suspect narrative, some of which indeed cannot be explained otherwise than as borrowings from this book. Villemarqué published his work in 1842, and Souvestre cited it as the source of his summary of the *Conte del Graal*. It was also an obvious source for his knowledge of *Peredur*. Now it is a striking fact that the *bassin* of gold, which has never been met with in the genuine popular traditions of Brittany and which does not occur in the *Conte del Graal* or *Peredur* (the words *graal* and *dyscyl* both meaning "dish," not "basin"), is to be found in the résumé which Villemarqué gives of the French poem:[71] "deux demoiselles, l'une avec un *tailleor* ou couteau[72] [*sic*] d'argent, l'autre avec un *graal* ou bassin d'or pur émaillé." In fact, Villemarqué uses the word *bassin* to translate not only *graal* but also the Welsh words *dyscyl* and *peir* (caldron).[73] He insists on the word, giving *Peredur* the alternative title, *Le Bassin magique*.[74] It

[69] Edward Jones, *Bardic Museum* (London, 1802), p. 48.
[70] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[71] Villemarqué, *op. cit.*, p. 136.
[72] *Tailleor* means a "carving platter," almost a synonym of *graal*.
[73] Villemarqué, *op. cit.*, pp. 337, 143. See J. Gwenogvryn Evans, *White Book Mabinogion* (Pwllheli, 1907), col. 130, 44.
[74] Villemarqué, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

would be extremely strange if Souvestre had met in a folk tale a descendant or counterpart of the Grail in the form of a basin, which is never found in the mediaeval texts but only in the summary of these texts which had appeared three years before the publication of *Perronik* and which he certainly had read. Besides, Souvestre assigns to the *bassin*, as we have seen, the power of reviving the dead, a power which is never, so far as I am aware, attributed to the Grail in the mediaeval romances—but which is twice mentioned by Villemarqué as a property of the *bassin* sought by Perceval and is once mentioned by him as a property of the *bassin* of Bran the Blessed, Welsh prototype of Bron, guardian of the Grail.[75] Here is another reason for questioning the good faith of Souvestre.

Villemarqué's book supplies an explanation of other details in *Perronik*. It informs us that "Taliésin place le bassin bardique dans la grotte d'une magicienne."[76] This reminds us of the fact that the *bassin* of the magician Rogéar was kept at the bottom of a vault. From Villemarqué might have come the genuinely traditional concept of the venerable man who was the brother of the owner of the *bassin* and who gave the hero good counsel.[77] So too with the damsel clad in black.[78] As for the dangers which Perronik surmounts and which Souvestre himself compares to those encountered by Peredur, could they not have been suggested by Villemarqué's statement that the author of *Peredur* involves his hero in contests "non-seulement avec des géants comme d'autres guerriers, mais encore avec des lions, des serpents, des dragons, des monstres marins . . . "?[79] The black man with six eyes, described by Souvestre, may have some connection with the one-eyed black man in *Peredur*.[80] To be sure, the details differ considerably in all these adventures, but an astute counterfeiter does not reveal too clearly his procedure.

Only the resemblance between the flaming lance of Rogéar and the blazing sword of Rhydderch remains to be explained; it is the one apparently primitive feature which does not have a plausible source in Villemarqué's book. I have not succeeded in discovering exactly where Souvestre might have come across the list of the Thirteen Treasures of the Isle of Britain, but there were certainly more books than one which contained it and which a man whose curiosity was aroused might have consulted. Already in 1802 the list had been published in English translation;[81] in 1819 it was known in Austria and the *dysgl* of Rhydderch had been recognized as a counterpart of the Grail;[82] Villemarqué himself

[75] *Ibid.*, pp. 139, 143.
[76] *Ibid.*, p. 142.
[77] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[78] *Ibid.*
[79] *Ibid.*, p. 145.
[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 362-365.
[81] See *supra*, note 69.
[82] *Jahrbücher der Literatur*, V (Wien, 1819), 42-43.

mentioned the thirteen wonderful objects in discussing the Celtic *bassin*,[83] though he did not name them. It is possible, therefore, that Souvestre knew the blazing sword of Rhydderch, deliberately blended it with the bleeding lance of the Grail romances, and so created the flaming lance of Rogéar.

We cannot, it seems, grant to Souvestre the title of a scrupulous, scientific, honest folklorist, but rather that of an extremely clever and artistic manipulator. *Perronik* is a Breton counterpart of the Ossianic poems of Macpherson.

Though convinced until recently of its genuineness by the arguments of Junk[84] and the considerations set forth above, I am now to be counted among the skeptics. Such disillusionment, however, should not diminish our confidence in the other results obtained in this study. No one has ever challenged the authenticity of the materials gathered by Luzel, Sébillot, and M. Cuillandre. As for the other parallels, it is impossible to regard the Breton versions as concocted on the basis of the romances—either internal evidence proves them to be independent or it can be shown that their authors did not have access to the mediaeval texts.

I do not pretend to have exhausted the subject of the relations between Breton folklore and the romances of the Round Table. Breton scholars may be able to point out other significant analogies.[85] But, in any case, the number of parallels which I have presented is large enough, I trust, to demonstrate that, in addition to the numerous Irish and Welsh elements which scholars have obliged us to recognize, there are others contributed by Little Britain—some of the most important and charming, indeed, in the *matière de Bretagne*.

Columbia University

---

[83] Villemarqué, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

[84] *Sitzungsberichte d. Kaiserlichen Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Wien*, ph.-hist. Kl., Bd. 168, Abh. 4.

[85] I have omitted some folklore commonplaces common to both bodies of fiction, for instance: disenchantment by a kiss, fairyland at the bottom of a well, banquet set out in an uninhabited castle. See Luzel, *Contes populaires de Basse-Bretagne*, I, 55 f., 246, 267 f. On legends of Merlin, see *Mélanges bretons et celtiques offerts à M. J. Loth* (Rennes, Paris, 1927), pp. 349-363.

RUSSIAN FRIENDS AND CORRESPONDENTS OF SIR WALTER SCOTT

GLEB STRUVE

PERHAPS nowhere on the Continent, in the late 1820s and 1830s, was the popularity of Sir Walter Scott so great as in Russia.[1] Foreign pilgrims to Abbotsford included a large proportion of Russians—writers, diplomats, soldiers. The letters which are here printed serve to illustrate this popularity.

My attention was first drawn to these letters by the register of Scott's correspondents in Wilfrid Partington's book, *Sir Walter's Post-Bag* (London, 1932), a sequel to his earlier work, *The Private Letter Books of Sir Walter Scott: Selections from the Abbotsford Manuscripts* (London, 1930). Both these books include selections from Scott's private letter books (containing about 6,000 letters addressed to Scott), which were acquired by the late Sir Hugh Walpole at an auction in 1921 and after his death bequeathed to the National Library of Scotland.

During World War II the Walpole collection was inaccessible to me, but Mr. W. M. Parker, who had assisted Sir Herbert Grierson in his edition of Scott's letters, kindly supplied me with copies of letters from Russian correspondents which were written in English, and with English versions of some of those that were written in French. In 1944, in response to an appeal from the editors of *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo (Literary Heritage)* of Moscow for material on Anglo-Russian literary relations for their projected Anglo-Russian volume (similar to the Franco-Russian volume published earlier), I sent them Russian versions of the letters of D. and V. Davydov and of A. Izmailov. In a letter, dated December 15, 1944, Mr. I. Silberstein, one of the editors of *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo,* thanked Mr. Parker and myself for the communication of these letters, and informed me that their volume was to include a chapter dealing with Sir Walter Scott's Russian connections, for which a great deal of fresh material had been found in Russia. This new material included a letter from Scott to Denis Davydov; five letters

[1] See, for example, the chapter called "Walter Scott and the Russian Romantic Movement" in Ernest J. Simmons, *English Literature and Culture in Russia (1553-1840),* Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, vol. XII (Cambridge, Mass., 1935). Of Scott's Russian contacts described in the present article, Simmons mentions only Denis Davydov, and him very briefly.

to Vladimir Davydov; three letters of Anne Scott to Vladimir Davydov; a long letter from Alexander Young to the same, written soon after Scott's death and describing Young's last meetings with him; a letter to Vladimir Davydov from John Lockhart; long passages from Vladimir Davydov's memoirs, describing his meetings with Scott at Abbotsford; and numerous mentions of Scott in Vladimir Davydov's letters from Scotland, along with other interesting unpublished documents.

The projected volume of *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo* has not yet appeared, and the now prevalent "anticosmopolitan" and "anticomparativist" trends in Soviet literary scholarship make its early appearence somewhat doubtful, since all the comments in it would probably have to be revised in the light of the new party line.

Of the letters printed below, which give only one side of Scott's Russian correspondence, only those of Vladimir Davydov are written in English; the others are in French. Since communicating some of these letters to *Literary Heritage* I have been able to transcribe them from the originals in the National Library of Scotland, and all are printed exactly as they were written.

DENIS DAVYDOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

Monsieur!

Je viens de lire la lettre de mon neveu Vladimir Davidoff à son pere dans laquelle il lui annonce l'honneur d'avoir été accueilli par vous avec tant de bienveillance, et la conversation qu'il eut avec vous au sujet de moi. Je vous avoue Monsieur que durant toute ma cariere militaire, durant ma vie entiere, rien de plus flatteur n'a retentit dans mon âme! Etre l'objet de l'interêt du premier genie de ce siecle, de celui dont je suis le plus ardent, le plus passionné des admirateurs est un honneur, je dirai même un bonheur, auquel je n'ai jamais osé pretendre, assuré que j'étois que des courses adventureuses de partisan, quelques succès de guerre et enfin quelques coups de sabre donnés et reçus, n'etoient que trop payés par la confiance de mes camarades et le choix que fesoient de moi mes chefs pour des entreprises perilleuses. Vous venez de mettre le comble a toutes ces recompenses Monsieur et c'est avec le plus vif sentiment de reconnoissance que je vous en remercie. Veuillez croire un soldat qui sait mieux sentir que s'exprimer, que si jamais il a besoin de stimulant il n'aura qu'a relire ces lignes magiques—lignes qu'il a copié et qu'il conserve soigneusement près des lettres dont l'a honoré le Maréchal Koutousoff pendant la desastreuse et glorieuse campagne de 1812.

Daignez agréer l'assurance de la reconnoissance la plus prononcée et des sentimens de respect et d'enthousiasme

Monsieur
De votre très humble et très obeissant serviteur
Denis Davidoff

Moscou
ce 10 Mars 1826.

This letter forms apparently the first link in the correspondence between Denis Davydov and Sir Walter Scott. Davydov (1784-1839), famous outside Russia as the intrepid guerrilla leader in the war of 1812

against Napoleon (he is often said to have been the prototype of Vas'ka Denisov in Tolstoy's *War and Peace*), was also a poet of merit and belonged to Pushkin's literary entourage. Besides poetry he left some interesting memoirs and a study of partisan warfare. Scott was interested at the time in Davydov and his exploits in connection with the *Life of Napoleon* on which he was engaged. In his study at Abbotsford there was even a portrait of the "Black Captain," as Davydov was known in England. Scott must have questioned Vladimir Davydov about his famous uncle.

Vladimir came to Edinburgh in 1825 to study at the University and remained there until 1828. Scott first met him in the autumn of 1825. Under November 23, 1825, he wrote in his diary with some venom about the foreigners who were beginning to haunt Abbotsford: "I do not like them. I hate fine waistcoats and breastpins upon dirty shirts. I detest the impudence that pays a stranger compliments and harangues about his works in the author's house, which is usually ill-breeding. Moreover, they are seldom long of making it evident that they know nothing about what they are talking of, excepting having seen the Lady of the Lake at the Opera."[2] The next day Scott returned to the subject and gave a very unflattering pen portrait of the well-known Italian writer and revolutionary, Ugo Foscolo, as "one of those animals who are lions at first, but by transmutation of two seasons become in regular course Boars . . ." Scott also mentioned another Italian "Animalaccio," de Salvo, "a brute of a Sicilian Marquis . . . who wrote something about Byron" and who "inflicted two days on us at Abbotsford." ". . . They never know what to make of themselves in the forenoon, but sit tormenting the women to play at proverbs and such trash," Scott added.[3]

From these two Italians he passed on to foreigners "*of a different caste.*" One of them was Olenin (Scott calls him "Count Olonyne"), son of the well-known Maecenas and president of the Russian Academy of Fine Arts, who visited Scott in October 1825 and received from him as a memento his portrait and a posy of cypress and other plants from the gardens of Abbotsford.[4] Scott said of him that he had "much sense, candour, and general information."[5] The other was Vladimir Davydov, the nephew of Denis, of whom Scott wrote in his diary: "There was at Abbotsford, and is here, for education just now, a young Count Davidow, with a tutor Mr. Colyar. He is a nephew of the famous Orlows. It is quite surprizing how much sense and sound thinking this youth has

[2] *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott: 1825-1826*, the text revised from a photostat in the National Library of Scotland, published for the Editor [J. G. Tait] by Oliver and Boyd (Edinburgh and London, 1939), pp. 11-12.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[4] Communicated by A. K. Pozharsky in *Zvenya*, vols. III-IV (Leningrad, 1935).

[5] *Journal . . . 1825-1826*, p. 12.

at the early age of sixteen, without the least self-conceit or forwardness. On the contrary, he seems kind, modest, and ingenuous. To questions which I asked about the state of Russia he answered with the precision and accuracy of twice his years. He is but sixteen. I should be sorry the saying were verified in him—

'So wise and young, they say, never live long.' "[6]

Vladimir Petrovich Davydov did not possess, in 1825, the title of count. This dignity was conferred on him in 1856 when, as the only surviving member of the Orlov family, he added his mother's name to his own, becoming Count Orlov-Davydov. Nor was he a nephew of "the famous Orlows"; his mother was the daughter of the youngest of the five brothers Orlov (two of whom were Catherine II's favorites), Vladimir, who at one time was director of the Russian Academy. Part of Vladimir Davydov's childhood was spent in Italy. While at the University of Edinburgh, he attended the lectures of Sir William Hamilton on metaphysics and of John Wilson ("Christopher North" of *Blackwood's Magazine*) on history. Upon graduation from the University of Edinburgh, he entered Russian diplomatic service and served in London and Paris.

After his grandfather's death he became one of the wealthiest landowners in Russia and applied himself to the management of his estates, covering more than 300,000 acres. He was one of the earliest and most convinced advocates of the emancipation of peasants, and proposed a plan of reform to Nicholas I, which was rejected. Under Alexander II he took part in the preparation of the peasant reform, but he was strongly opposed to liberating the peasants with land. He travelled extensively and wrote an account of his travels in Greece and the Near East, and also a biography of his grandfather Orlov.

A great admirer of England, he published anonymously, on the eve of the Crimean War, a curious pamphlet[7] in which, addressing himself to the Academic Senate of his alma mater, and through it to the public opinion of Great Britain, he made an attempt to avert the impending war between England and Russia by appealing to the sense of Christian unity, and at the same time trying to prove that Russia had no territorial aspirations and did not need Constantinople—the possession of which, he said, might even be dangerous to her. The authorship of this pamphlet was disclosed in the long obituary of Count Orlov-Davydov which appeared in the London *Times* on August 1, 1882.

The obituary stressed the influence the Toryism of John Wilson had

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

[7] *An appeal on the Eastern Question to the Senatus Academicus of the Royal College of Edinburgh*, by A Russian, quondam civis Bibliothecae Edinensis (Edinburgh and London, 1854).

had on the conservative principles which distinguished Davydov throughout his life, and stated that "a profound influence was exercised over the Russian youth by the acquaintance with other celebrated Englishmen, many of whom he frequently met at Abbotsford after a close friendship had sprung up between him and Sir Walter Scott—a friendship which is described as condescending on the one hand and full of sincere admiration on the other." According to the same obituary, "It was at a dinner of the Highland Celtic Society, presided over by Sir Walter Scott himself, that young Davydov made his maiden speech, and the vociferous applause which greeted his first attempt in English appears to have made an impression upon him for life. While in Scotland nearly all his leisure time was spent at Abbotsford. When financial ruin overtook the great poet, Mr. Davydov bought the manuscript of the 'Talisman', and fondly preserved it in the library of his country seat at Otrada, near Moscow. After four years of study, the Russian student left Edinburgh with his degree of Doctor *utriusque juris*, and was attached to the Russian Embassy in London. At parting Sir Walter Scott wrote the following words in his friend's album:

> 'Do weel and dread nought though thou be espyit,
> 'He is little gude worth that is not envyit;
> 'Take thou nae heed what tales man tells;
> 'If thou wouldst live undeemed gang where nae man dwells.'"

In his posthumously published biography of his grandfather Vladimir Davydov recalled that in the inscription in his album Scott said that, not having the gift of writing beautiful poetry, he preferred to express his good wishes "in honest prose," and ended with the above quotation. This biographical sketch of Count Vladimir Orlov contains some interesting recollections of Davydov's relations with Scott, including a description of his first visit to Abbotsford, when he also met Thomas Moore, and an account of the above-mentioned dinner of the Highland Celtic Society at which Scott proposed a toast to Emperor Nicholas and described Russia as "the girdle and bulwark of Europe."[7a]

VLADIMIR DAVYDOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

DEAR SIR,

Having this day received from Russia a letter addressed to you, I take the liberty of inclosing it, and of informing you of what gave rise to it and how it was sent to me. The author of it is my uncle General Denis Davidoff, the black captain. Having learnt from my letter to my father the honor, which you did him by keeping his portrait in your room, and your general approbation of his conduct, he was so gratified and, I may say, enraptured with the honor that he could not refrain from expressing to you his satisfaction. He writes to me in the warmest expressions of enthusiasm, and he is not without fear lest his feelings on this occasion

[7a] "Biograficheskii ocherk grafa V. G. Orlova" (A Biographical Sketch of Count V. G. Orlov), *Russkii Arkhiv*, III (1908), 483-488.

may have made his letter to you utterly unintelligible. He flatters himself with the hope that you will honor him with two lines at least of your own writing. And though he has not taken the liberty of asking from you either this favor or that of sending your portrait to him, he expresses to me the ardent desire, which he feels of having such monuments of you in his possession and of transmitting them as "sacred relics" to his posterity. Should you be pleased to grant the latter of these requests, I shall with your permission send to you your portrait, under which my uncle will read with the greatest satisfaction "Sir Walter Scott au partizan Denis Davidoff". I feel conscious of the indelicacy of the message, which I have at present the honor of transmitting to you, and beg of you to excuse it in consideration of my uncle's enthusiasm. I should have awaited your arrival in town to have had the honor of handing you this letter in person, had not my departure from [for?] London been fixed for the beginning of next week. I take this opportunity, dear Sir, of assuring you of the profound respect and sincere devotion, with which I have the honor to remain

Yours most faithfully
V. DAVIDOFF

Edinburgh, 42 York Place, 12th April 1826

The above letter of Vladimir Davydov must have accompanied the preceding letter from his uncle. On April 14, 1826, Scott wrote in his diary: "Had a letter from the famous Denis Davidoff, the Black Captain, whose abilities as a partizan were so much distinguished during the retreat from Moscow. If I can but wheedle him out of a few anecdotes, it would be a great hawl."[8] Three days later Scott wrote his reply to Denis Davydov. Judging by Mr. Silberstein's letter to me, this letter of Scott has now been found among the Orlov-Davydov family papers and was to be included in the above-mentioned volume of *Literary Heritage*. In 1936, in an article in an earlier volume of *Literary Heritage*, V. Orlov spoke of all letters of Scott to Davydov as irretrievably lost.[9] However, Mr. Orlov overlooked the fact that a portion of this very letter, dated April 17, 1826, had appeared in a biographical sketch of Denis Davydov in a volume containing the lives of a number of Russian military leaders.[10] This portion, printed both in English and in Russian, contained the following passage:

It is no small honour for a retired individual like myself to be distinguished in such flattering terms by a person so much admired for the patriotic gallantry with which he served his country in the hour of extreme need, and whose name will be read for ages in the proudest though most melancholy page of Russian history. You can hardly conceive how many hearts, and none with warmer devotion than his who now writes to you, were turned towards all your bivouac of snow with

[8] *Journal . . . 1825-1826,* p. 154.

[9] "Sud'ba literaturnogo nasledstva Denisa Davydova" (The Fate of Denis Davydov's Literary Heritage), *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo,* XIX-XX (1935), 297-340.

[10] *Zhizneopisaniia russkikh voennykh deiatelei* (Biographies of Russian Military Leaders), ed. Vs. Mamyshev (St. Petersburg, 1885). See also my article, "Scott Letters Discovered in Russia," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Dec. 1944.

hope and anxiety which nothing but that critical period could have inspired, or with what a burst of enthusiasm your final course of victory was hailed in this country.

Your extreme kindness promises to me to expect pardon for a request which I am about to make and the compliance with which I will hold an unspeakable favour. I am extremely desirous to know a little in detail the character of the partisan war conducted with so much adventure, spirit and indefatigable activity in the campaign of Moscow. I know that I would be most unreasonable in asking anything of that sort which could occupy your time or occasion you trouble, but a few sketches or anecdotes, however slight, from the hand of the Black Captain would be esteemed by me an inestimable favour . . .

. . . It is very true that I have been able to procure a drawing of Captain Davidow which hangs above one of the things I hold most precious, namely a good broadsword which was handed down to me by my ancestors, and which in its day was not bloodless, though we have been a peaceful race for three generations. The military spirit has revived in my son who is a captain of Hussars and reckoned a [good] officer.[11]

Throughout 1825-27 there are, in Scott's diary, numerous references to Vladimir Davydov and his visits to Abbotsford, which fully confirm what the *Times* obituary said about the friendship between them. On December 23, 1825, a month after the first mention of Vladimir Davydov's name, Scott notes that he and his tutor kept a dinner engagement with them "notwithstanding the death of the Emperor Alexander" and "went to the play with the womankind" while he "stayed at home to write."[12] On June 16, 1826, Scott mentions giving an engraving of his portrait by Raeburn to the young Davydov to be sent to his uncle.[13] On July 1, 1826, there is the following entry: "As the Selkirk election comes on Monday, I go out to-day to Abbotsford, and carry young Davidoff and his tutor with me, to see our quiet way of managing the choice of a national representative . . ."[14] And the next day, after noting that Borthwickbrae "was elected with the usual unanimity of the Forest freeholders," he adds: "This was a sight to my young Muscovite."[15] On July 5, 1826, Scott mentions a conversation with Davydov about "the cause of the late discontents in Russia" (the so-called Decembrist uprising) and says that Davydov ascribed it to "a deep-seated Jacobin conspiracy to overthrow the state and empire and establish a government by consuls."[16]

On September 1, 1827, Scott writes in his diary: "Sir William Hamilton and his brother, Captain Hamilton, called; also young Davidoff. I am somewhat sorry for my young friend. His friends permit him

[11] The word "good" is given conjecturally—in the Russian publication there is a meaningless word in its place.

[12] *Journal . . . 1825-1826*, p. 54.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 195.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 196.

to remain too long in Britain to be happy in Russia. Yet this [is a] prejudice of those who suppose that when the institutions and habits by which they are governed come to be known to strangers, they must become exclusively attached to them. This is not so. The Hottentot returns from civilisation to the wild manners of his kraal, and wherefore should not a Russian resume his despotic ideas when he returned to his country?"[17] On November 18, 1827, Davydov brought Scott a present from Russia —"a steel snuff-box, wrought and lined with gold, having arms on the top, and on the sides various scenes from the environs and principal buildings of St. Petersburgh—a *joli cadeau*—and I take it very kind of my young friend."[18] On March 25, 1828, Davydov took leave of the Scotts before going to London. Scott wrote in his diary: "Mr. Davidoff showed himself a good deal affected. I hope well of this young nobleman, and trust the result will justify my expectations, but it may be doubted if his happiness be well considered by those who send a young person, destined to spend his life under a despotic government, to receive the ideas and opinions of such a people as we are:

'Where ignorance is bliss
'Tis folly to be wise.' "[19]

After leaving Edinburgh in March 1828 Davydov apparently never saw Scott again, but they exchanged letters in May of that year, when Davydov was with the Russian Embassy in London. From London he went later to Paris, where he attended the lectures of Guizot and Cousin, thus being able to compare the methods by which history and philosophy were taught in Edinburgh and in Paris.[19a] On his way back to Russia he was introduced to Goethe. In later life Davydov often revisited Britain, which he came to look upon as his second home. In 1872 he "had the pleasure of meeting with Scott's great-grand-daughter, and talking to her of those old happy Abbotsford days."[20]

DENIS DAVYDOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

MONSIEUR,

Je vous rends mille grâces pour le précieux cadeau que vous venez de m'envoyer. J'ai tardé de vous en remercier parce que pendant cinq mois de suite je me suis trouvé a la tête des braves aux pieds de l'arrarat. Les papiers publics ont dûs vous apprendre Monsieur que celui que vous honnorez de votre bienveillance particuliere, a sû s'en rendre digne : il a combattu et a eu du succès.

---

[17] *Journal . . . 1827-1828* (Edinburgh and London, 1941), p. 96.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

[19a] In the above-mentioned recollections of his life abroad Davydov said that Cousin regarded Sir William Hamilton as "the greatest thinker of his time and *'notre maître à tous.'* "

[20] See *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott: 1825-32. From the Original Manuscripts at Abbotsford*, new ed. [ed. David Douglas], (Edinburgh, 1927), p. 15, editor's note.

Profitant des quartiers d'hiver je viens reposer mon âme au sein de ma famille; a la reprise des hostilités je serai derechef au champ d'honneur. C'est un fier voyage que je fais dans l'espace de cinq mois! 1500 lieues de France pour aller, venir, et retourner a mon poste. et cela, en franchissant trois fois le Caucase, au milieu d'une population toujours armée et habituée depuis des siècles au brigandage dont elle a fait sa première vertu. Un jour je tacherai d'esquisser les mœurs de ces nations belliqueuses qui par le contraste des vertus et de crimes, d'héroisme et de lacheté, de franchise et de fourberie sont dignes de la curiosité du philosophe et de l'homme de guerre.

J'ai appris de mon neveu Vladimir Davidoff que vous vous faites un cabinet d'armes. Permettez moi Monsieur de vous envoyer quelques armes des montagnards du Caucase, des Curdes habitans aux pieds de l'arrarat et des Persans? Je me trouverai trop heureux de contribuer à completter votre cabinet des armes prises par moi sur l'ennemi. J'ai déjà à ma disposition une lance Curde, un carquois plein de flêches, un arc et un poignard Montagnards qui vous sont destinés; dans peu j'y ajouterai un fusil persan, un sabre et un pistolet montagnards. Aussitôt que cette armure sera reunie j'aurai l'honneur de vous en faire hommage sans delai, en vous la faisant passer par la voie de l'ambassade d'angleterre.

Mon neveu me dit aussi que vous Monsieur et le général Hamilton m'ont fait l'honneur de boire a ma santé. Agréez en je vous prie mes remercimens les plus sinceres et veuillez bien vous charger de presenter mes respects a ce digne général avec qui j'aurois bien envie de faire une connoissance particuliere. Soldats, nous sommes tous prêtres d'un même Dieu, nous avons tous desservis la Chapelle ardente avec la même faveur, nous ne devons donc pas être étrangers l'un à l'autre.

Vous me marquez dans votre lettre Monsieur le désir d'avoir quelque idée sur le caractere de la guerre de partisan. Les circonstances presentes m'empêchent de vous satisfaire immediatement, mais a mon retour de la Perse je me ferais un honneur et un plaisir de vous envoyer mes *Memoires sur les opperations de mon parti en 1812*, et mon *Essai sur la Theorie de la guerre de Partisan* dont la troisième édition a paru il y a de cela deux ans et que je revoyois, corrigeois et augmentois au moment de mon depart pour l'armée. Vladimir qui connoit bien les deux langues russe et angloise se fera un plaisir de vous traduire mes souvenirs et mes observations.

Je le charge aussi de vous traduire Monsieur une bagatelle poetique que j'ai fait depuis peu au bivouac. Je n'ai pas osé vous l'envoyer directement, vu sa nullité.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec la plus haute estime et, pour ainsi dire, avec un culte passionné pour votre génie et votre caractère moral,

Monsieur
Votre très humble et très obeissant
serviteur

DENIS DAVIDOFF

ce $\frac{10}{22}$ Janvier 1827
Moscou

The "precious gift" which Davydov mentions here must have been Scott's portrait with his inscription. As mentioned above, Scott gave it to Vladimir Davydov to be sent to his uncle. In noting this fact in his diary Scott wrote: "Curious that he should be interested in getting the resemblance of a person whose mode of attaining some distinction has been very different. But I am sensible, that if there be anything good

about my poetry or prose either, it is a hurried frankness of composition which pleases soldiers, sailors and young people of bold and active disposition. I have been no sigher in shades—no writer of

> 'Songs and sonnets and rustical roundelays
> Framed on fancies and whistled on reeds.' "[21]

Davydov the poet was unknown to Scott; but had he known his poetry he probably would have liked the manly note so often sounded in it, though Davydov's poetry was by no means all martial—he also wrote many fashionable elegies, rather sentimental, and in fact was sometimes a "sigher in shades."

Davydov's letter, as he points out, was written while resting in Moscow after the exertions and labors of the Persian campaign in which he took an active part.

VLADIMIR DAVYDOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

DEAR SIR,

I have been looking into some of my Russian books in the hopes of finding there some of the information, which you were anxious to procure. I am not aware of having ever heard of a *General* Dourakoff, though a family of that name exists and would be spelt in that way in English, whilst the name of the General in chief, who was killed during the war is DOKTOUROFF. The words, which you were desirous to have the sound of are the following:

> Gospodee pomilouï nas
> Lord have mercy upon us.

They are very probably the words which the soldiers pronounced when they crossed themselves and went to battle, as this is an ejaculation constantly in the mouths both of the soldiers and of the people in general.

With regard to General Boutourline's work, on which you desire to have some notes, I find that I have a short review of it in the "Son of the Country", which I should be most happy to translate if you should think that it could interest you at all. I have also found in the same journal a detailed description of the passage of the Berezina translated from the work of Mr Shambré entitled: *Histoire de l'Expédition de Russie*, par M. . . . Paris 1823, tome second. I am much afraid, dear Sir, that these documents are of too little importance to attract your attention, but I have marked them down here on account of the references which are to be found in them.

There is a curious piece by our late historian Karamzin on the burning of Moscow. The author, being freed by order of the Emperor from all dependence upon the Censorship, said with reason that no human being influenced his pen, and his essay upon the Russian campaign shews, I think, that he had no scruple to mark down the Truth. I have been bold enough to translate a small part of it, in which the allusions to an event too generally known to allow of any description seem to infer that the burning of Moscow was caused by the Russians. This is undoubtedly the prevalent opinion in Russia, and if for a long time the destruction of the Capital was attributed to the French, it could have been only with a view of exciting still more the national hatred.

---

[21] *Journal . . . 1827-1828*, p. 186.

The earliest numbers of the Son of the Country, which began to be published at the period of that memorable campaign, are full of interesting and in great measure of authentic details on this subject. I regret to say that I have not any of these numbers by me, but if the Spring be not too late to consult them, I might get them over with the greatest facility and any other works, which you would be so kind as to mark down. The only farther documents, if I may so call them, which I have by me are: a description of the battle of Katzbach, extracts from the notes written by a Russian officer during the campaign of 1814, a short essay by the Archbishop of Moscow on the moral reasons which secured to the Russians indisputable superiority over the French in the war of 1812, and the historical piece by Karamzin, of which the enclosed is an extract.

Allow me, dear Sir, in conclusion to this note to express to you my gratitude for the permission you have given me of speaking to you on a subject which is at the moment exciting the curiosity and the anxious expectation of the world, and at the same time my regret at not being in my power to give you any important information.

Believe me, dear Sir, with great respect

Your obliged and faithful servt

V. Davidoff

42 York Place /Edinburgh/

7th February, 1827

P.S. If you should not find the inclosed manuscript legible, I beg that you should send it back to me and allow me to copy it out a little more clearly.

This letter again must have accompanied the preceding letter of Denis Davydov. It reflects Scott's interest in the Russian side of the 1812 campaign and the help which Vladimir Davydov was giving him. "Shambré," whose book Davydov mentions, is the Marquis de Chambray.[22] In his *Life of Napoleon* Scott made use both of Karamzin's account of the fire of Moscow and of Buturlin's book.[23] *The Son of the Country* is the well-known Russian magazine *Syn Otechestva*.

The author of the *Times* obituary of Vladimir Davydov says that Davydov "furnished the venerable Scotch bard with an authentic description of the burning of Moscow, most of which he obtained from his grandfather, the Count, and nearly the whole of it, with but little alterations, was embodied in Sir Walter's 'Life of Napoleon.'"

It is interesting to note that, in addition to translating for Scott various historical materials bearing on the 1812 campaign, Vladimir Davydov also made, at his special request, a translation of the famous masterpiece of early Russian literature, *The Lay of Igor's Campaign* (this fact is mentioned in one of Vladimir Davydov's letters discovered in Russia); but unfortunately we do not know Scott's opinion of it or what happened to the translation.

[22] Chambray's *Histoire de l'expédition de Russie* has been described as one of the best contemporary works on that campaign.

[23] This probably refers to Buturlin's *Histoire militaire de la campagne de Russie en 1812* (Paris et Pétersburg, 1824).

DENIS DAVYDOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

MONSIEUR.

Revenu malade du climat dévorateur de la Georgie, je n'ai pas eu assez de loisir pour completer l'armure qu'il m'etoit si a cœur de vous offrir et des objets que j'ai deja eu a ma disposition furent perdus en chemin par la negligence de mes gens qui reduisirent mes trophés a peu de choses. C'est ce peu de choses que j'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer Monsieur en vous suppliant de l'accepter comme souvenir d'un homme dont l'admiration pour vous n'a pas de bornes et qui ne peut assez vous remercier pour le precieux cadeau que vous lui avez fait.

L'arc est une arme qui est devenue bien rare au Caucase: ce n'est que quelques ultras du pays qui s'en servent encore; voila pourquoi celui que j'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer est si usé. Chez ce peuple la civilisation avance avec peine mais elle avance toujours et les nouvelles générations profitent de ce qu'elles voyent d'utile chez les peuples plus civilisés. Ainsi, les Tcherkesses (montagnards du Caucase) se battent maintenant tout comme nous: avec de bons fusils et de bons pistolets et n'ont conservés de l'ancienne armure que leurs sabres très courts, nommés *chachka* a qui cependant ils ne peuvent se resoudre a donner une lance pour aide—le beau reste de leur courage primitif s'indigne encore de s'en servir dans des combats corps a corps, vu sa longueur.

J'ai eu l'honneur de vous ecrir ainsi qu'a Wladimir Davidoff cet hyver, mais je crains que mes lettres ne se soient égarées en chemin, car je n'en ai aucun vent depuis. Craignant de vous importuner par une bagatelle poetique que j'ai fait au bruit des armes et sur le champ tumultueux des batailles, je la lui avois envoyé incluse dans une de ces lettres pour vous la traduire, si faire se peut. Mais il n'en dit rien ni a moi ni a son pere et ses sœurs, ce qui prouve que mes craintes sont assez fondées.

En revenant de la Georgie, j'ai passé quelque temps aux fameuses sources minérales du Caucase qui se trouvent dans le pays de ces mêmes guerriers dont je vous envoye les armes. Il seroit curieux de voir figurer ces eaux dans un roman, comme les eaux de St. Ronan; que de contrastes on y trouveroit. Cependant les principaux traits s'y trouveroient toujours, car on y verrai là comme à toutes le eaux du monde et le comerage des femmes, et les petites jalousies de société et des Ladys Penelopes et des Ladys Binks. Nous avions aussi un espece de Touchwood qui se meloit de tout, mais sans la vivacité originale de celui des eaux de St. Ronan et sans un sou d'argent dans sa poche. Le grand gala de Mowbray auroit pour faire pendant à la course que toute la société fit pendant le Beiram (fête musulmane) à l'aoul ou village des Tcherkesses, située a quelques milles des eaux, où au lieu de theatre et de musique nous ne vimes que les jeux de ce peuple belliqueux chez qui même la danse est une espece de lutte. Aussi la liberté des promenades dans les environs s'en ressent, tout est sur le pied de guerre, tout est armé jusqu'aux buveurs d'eau qui, comme vous le savez, sont depuis le deluge universel, les moins mechants de notre espece.

Veuillez agréer l'assurance des sentiments les plus distingués et de la parfaite estime.

Monsieur
De Votre très humble et très obeissant
serviteur
DENIS DAVIDOFF

ce $\frac{10}{22}$ Septembre 1827
Moscou

This is the last letter of Denis Davydov we possess, and the most interesting of all. Here we see Davydov the man of letters and the enthusiastic reader of Scott. He must have read *St. Ronan's Well* in the French translation which appeared in the same year as the original (1824); the Russian version was not published till 1828. It is interesting to note Davydov's enthusiasm; this novel of Scott, which differed from his other work by its contemporary setting and its elements of almost Dickensian realism, was received rather coolly in England and France. On the other hand, the famous Russian critic Belinsky later (in 1841) praised it very highly, considering it "to be incomparably superior to, and as it were *more human* than, *The Bride of Lammermoor*," and speaking of its abundance and intricacy of incident.[24]

Modern opinion has tended to revise the unfavorable opinion of Scott's contemporaries (which he was inclined to share) of this novel. In 1872 the opinion of a critic of the London *Quarterly Review*, who called *St. Ronan's Well* one of the best novels ever written, could be rightly described as "unique."[25] But William C. Antwerp, in commenting on his collection of first editions of Scott, writes: "Sir Leslie Stephen tells a story of a dozen modern connoisseurs of the Waverley novels who agreed that each should write down separately the name of his favourite. It appeared that each had, without concert, named *St. Ronan's Well*."[26] And E. A. Baker in his *History of the English Novel*, while criticizing the novel for its mixture of tragedy and comedy and contrasting it unfavorably with *The Bride of Lammermoor*, praises highly the character of Clara Mowbray.[27]

It is also interesting to note that Davydov's wish to see a similar picture of a Russian watering resort in the Caucasus was fulfilled thirteen years later, when he was no longer alive, with the publication of Lermontov's novel, *A Hero of Our Time*. It is quite probable that Lermontov had read Scott's novel. But the parallel between the two can hardly be pursued very far, and it is doubtful whether we can speak of any direct influence of Scott—the whole tone of the novel, and the manner in which it is written, are quite different; however, there are in Lermontov's novel some situations and some minor details reminiscent of Scott, and here and there it is possible to see that general similarity of spa society types, of which Davydov speaks in his letter. Readers of Lermontov's novel will remember that its hero, Pechorin, before the

[24] V. Belinsky, *Sobranie sochinenii* (Collected Works), in three volumes, vol. II: *Stat'i i retsenzii 1841-1845* (Articles and Book Reviews for 1841-1845), ed. S. P. Bychkov (Moscow, 1948), pp. 24-25.

[25] See James T. Hillhouse, *The Waverley Novels and Their Critics* (Minneapolis, 1936), p. 186.

[26] Wm. C. Antwerp, *A Collector's Comment on His First Editions of the Works of Sir Walter Scott* (San Francisco, 1932), p. 130.

[27] E. A. Baker, *A History of the English Novel*, VI, 193-198.

duel, reads another novel by Scott, *Old Mortality,* which enjoyed a much wider popularity in Russia than did *St. Ronan's Well.*[28]

Scott's reaction to the above letter of Davydov was, characteristically enough, that of a staunch British patriot and Tory who could not help rejoicing at Russia's setbacks in the Persian campaign. In his diary he wrote (November 18, 1827): "I had a letter also from . . . Denis Davydov, the black captain of the French retreat. The Russians are certainly losing ground and men in Persia, and will not easily get out of the scrape of having engaged an active enemy in a difficult and unhealthy country. I am glad of it; it is an overgrown power; and to have them kept quiet at least is well for the rest of Europe"[29] Davydov would certainly have been upset by these anti-Russian sentiments of his idol.

Shortly before Scott's death Denis Davydov wrote long observations on the *Life of Napoleon,* which he intended to embody in a letter to Scott. This letter was about to be posted when the news of Scott's death reached Russia. Davydov later sent it as an article to the *Syn Otechestva,* where it appeared in 1840. Under the title "Pis'mo k Valter-Skottu" (A Letter to Walter Scott) it was included in the 1848 and subsequent

[28] To my knowledge, Scott's *St. Ronan's Well* has never been mentioned in connection with Lermontov's novel. There is no mention of it in B. Tomashevsky's very interesting article in the first Lermontov volume published by *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo* on the occasion of the centenary of Lermontov's death (vol. XLIII-XLIV, Moscow, 1941). The article, entitled "Proza Lermontova i zapadnoevropeiskaia literaturnaia traditsiia" (Lermontov's Prose and the Western European Literary Tradition), discusses the relation between Lermontov's novels, with special reference to *A Hero of Our Time,* and contemporary European fiction, and gives a number of interesting parallels between *A Hero of Our Time* and Charles Bernard's novel *Gerfaut.* In the same volume there is a long article by A. Fedorov, "Tvorchestvo Lermontova i zapadnye literatury" (Lermontov's Work and Western Literatures), dealing mostly with Lermontov's poetry and drama. Both articles are free from the now fashionable anti-Western bias, and their authors have already been accused of "cosmopolitanism" and "comparativism."

It is worth noting that one episode in *St. Ronan's Well* may also have played a part in suggesting the main episode in the plot of Pushkin's short story, "The Snowstorm." I mean Etherington's marriage to Clara Mowbray, when, taking advantage of the darkness in church and of his resemblance to his brother, Francis Tyrrel, he impersonates the latter. The circumstances of this marriage, and the role it plays in the plot, are different from those in Pushkin; at best one can only speak of Pushkin having received a possible additional stimulus from reading Scott's novel. For a general discussion of Scott's influence on Pushkin's *Tales of Belkin* and their structure, see D. Yakubovich, "Predislovie k povestiam Belkina i povestvovatelnye priëmy Valter Skotta" (The Preface to the Tales of Belkin and Walter Scott's Narrative Devices) in *Pushkin v mirovoi literature: Sbornik statei* (Pushkin in World Literature: A Collection of Essays) (Leningrad, 1926). For a discussion of the genesis, and a general analysis, of Pushkin's "Snowstorm," see W. Lednicki, "Bits of Table Talk on Pushkin, III: 'The Snowstorm,'" in *American Slavic and East European Review,* Dec. 1947. Neither Mr. Yakubovich nor Professor Lednicki mentions *St. Ronan's Well* among Pushkin's sources. This novel of Scott was not among the books in Pushkin's library, but it is quite likely that, like Davydov, he had read it.

[29] *Journal . . . 1827-1828,* p. 135.

editions of Davydov's works.[30] The letter appears to have been begun earlier, for Davydov again thanks Scott for his portrait and speaks of the Kurd lance, Persian dagger, and Circassian bow which he despatched to Scott through the British embassy in St. Petersburg. Referring to his observations on the book, he asks Scott to forgive him his "soldierly frankness"; but, says he, "I would be unworthy of your benevolent attention if I dared repay it by hypocrisy, which is not characteristic of me at all, and by criminal silence over your involuntarily erroneous account of some of the actions of our armies and of the commander whose deep imagination saved my country, and whose name is both precious and sacred to us, Russians." Then follow detailed, mostly factual, criticisms of several passages in Scott's book.

VLADIMIR DAVYDOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

Ashburnham House [London], 20th May 1828

DEAR SIR WALTER,

As you wished me to give you in writing the purport of the conversation I had with Count Voronzoff relatively to the last moments of Mr. Pitt, I profit with pleasure of an early opportunity of doing so & hence the greater satisfaction in performing this task as it was Count Voronzoff's particular wish to have communicated to you what he knew of Mr. Pitt's death, & had heard from the mouth of the Prime Minister himself, with whom he had lived on a footing of intimacy rarely to be found existing between a foreign Ambassador and the first Minister of the Court to which he is attached.

From the conversation Count Voronzoff had with him he was satisfied that the news of the battle of Austerlitz had no share in bringing about his death. Being at the time at Bath he saw the Ministers come successively to deplore the event of the defeat, and being anxious to have the private opinion of Mr. Pitt himself he stayed till all had quitted his bedside, and then addressed him upon the subject. "The event," said Mr. Pitt with composure, "is a disastrous one, but if your Sovereign and my own are conscious of the dignity & power of their own people, they will rise superior to the present events. For one or two years we ought to remain quiet; and the present success of Napoleon will excite him to still greater encroachments. He will prescribe new conditions & will at last bring on his own ruin." It is remarkable that at the same time Mr. Fox was calling violently for a treaty of Peace & Alliance with Napoleon, and representing to the House of Commons the impossibility of a Coalition ever arising with a view to bringing down the absolute sway of the French Emperor.

The real cause of the death of Mr. Pitt, Count Voronzoff says, was in his violent exertions every night in the House of Commons and in his extreme anxiety to save his friend Lord Melville from the aspersions thrown upon him. On this subject Mr. Pitt told Count Voronzoff "they wish to pierce me through the body of my friend."

This, dear Sir Walter, is all that I have to communicate to you on this subject, & it was at the request of Count Voronzoff, who is so deeply interested in it, & so desirous of its being handed down to posterity in its true light, that I spoke to you about it the last time I had the pleasure of seeing you.

I conclude these lines, dear Sir Walter, by thanking you once more for all your

[30] Davydov, *Sochineniia* (Works) (St. Petersburg, 1848), pp. 283-325.

kindness. My affection for Scotland, in which I have passed so many happy years, is I think second to no other attachment within my heart, and I shall always preserve the dearest remembrance of my visits to Abbotsford. I hope I shall ever be worthy of your friendship; & beg you to believe me to be with great respect

Your faithful & affectionate servant
VLADIMIR DAVIDOFF

The above is the last letter of Vladimir Davydov to Scott. It was probably written in reply to Scott's letter of May 2, 1828 (mentioned by Mr. Silberstein in his letter to me). It is of considerable historical interest and has a bearing on another chapter in Anglo-Russian contacts. Count Simon Vorontsov (Woronzow) was Russian ambassador in London from 1785 to 1806. After his retirement he continued to live in England, where he died in 1832. He was an enthusiastic Anglophile, an aristocratic Liberal, a great admirer of British institutions and of Adam Smith. In 1791, at the time of Pitt's Russian armament, he worked with Fox and other members of the Opposition to frustrate Pitt's anti-Russian plans; but after 1793, when England became Russia's ally against revolutionary France, he became a great admirer and personal friend of Pitt. After Pitt's death he wrote to Canning: "Comme ministre, il était supérieur à tout ce que nous connaissons dans l'histoire; et comme particulier, la pureté de ses mœurs et la douceur de son caractère faisaient de lui l'honneur et l'ornement de l'espèce humaine."[31] In Davydov's letter we can feel that, more than twenty years after Pitt's death, Vorontsov still cherished his memory.

In the already mentioned biography of his grandfather Davydov said that Vorontsov had wanted him to persuade Scott to delete from the subsequent editions of his *Life of Napoleon* the passage about the disheartening effect on Pitt of the news of the defeat at Austerlitz. Davydov added that he was unable to carry out Vorontsov's wish.

ALEXANDER IZMAILOV TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

MONSIEUR LE BARRONET,

Un auteur russe, qui vous est peut-être tout à fait inconnu, ose vous importuner par une lettre en mauvais français. Il n'aurait pas pris cette hardiesse, si le bon Mr Makkensi, votre compatriote, ne l'eût pas encouragé. Ah! il nous quitte, notre ami Makkensi, ce brave et noble jeune homme, que nous aimions tant. Il n'entendra plus nos tostes que nous lui porterons dans nos diners amicals; mais toutes fois que nous boirons à la santé des *absents*, le nom de Makkensi sera répété avec un soupir involontaire.

J'ai passé presque toute ma vie à Petersbourg en m'occupant des affaires de la Couronne au bureau des finances et en cultivant les belles-lettres. Le sort m'a jetté a Twer et puis à Archangel. Je m'ennuyais, je mourais à Twer: on n'y fait que jouer aux cartes, on n'y aime pas la Litterature et l'on regarde comme des ennemis du bien public les auteurs, surtout les auteurs satiriques et véridiques, qui osent dire ce qu'ils pensent des petits seigneurs provinciaux et font rire sur

[31] *Arkhiv Vorontsova*, XVI, 372-375.

leurs dépens. Mais je me suis ressuscité à Archangel. Ici j'ai trouvé une très bonne société: nos braves marins russes et les negocians étrangers, surtout des anglais et des suisses.

Apres 80 ans, ou plus, moi je suis le second poëte russe qui vient à Archangel. Le premier, c'était le père de notre Poësie, immortel Lomonosoff, fils d'un pauvre pêcheur de Kholmogor, district du gouvernement d'Archangel. On lui érige ici un monument qu'il a bien mérité comme un grand poëte lyrique et comme un homme savant qui a cultivé avec le plus grand succès notre langue, si belle et si difficile.

Agréez, Monsieur, les sentimens de respect que je vous dois pour votre talent distingué et peut-être unique. Vos romans historiques font les délices de toutes nos gens de lettres et du beau sexe. Vous êtes lu et admiré non seulement en Russie, mais même en Syberie qui n'est pas peut-être si sauvage, comme quelques provinces russes habitées par des gentilshommes ignorans, bons chasseurs, bons buveurs, grands joueurs et très mauvais lecteurs.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec la plus grande considération,

Monsieur le Barronet,
votre très humble et très obeissant
serviteur
ALEXANDER ISMAÏLOFF
(fabuliste russe et vice-gouverneur
d'Archangel)

ce 3 de Juillet 1828
Archangel

The author of this letter, Alexander Izmaïlov (1779-1831), was a minor Russian writer, fabulist and satirist, and editor of the magazine *Blagonamerenny*. At the time of writing the letter he held the post of vice-governor of Archangel. His letter voices the enthusiasm for Scott which was so widespread in Russia in the 1820s. It also throws some light on Russian provincial life. Neither Mr. Parker nor I can identify "Makkensi" (Mackenzie). He was probably a young Scottish merchant in Russia.

ANNA BUNINA TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

MONSIEUR.

La fille du Nord glacé admire les productions du Genie Anglais! Je ne possède pas votre langue, Monsieur. Mais, avec mon peu de savoir j'ai appris par cœur la description de toute la guèrre de *Marmion*, et je la répète avec le plaisir toujours nouveaux: en cas, si j'en serai versée d'avantage,—je ne réponds point, si je n'apprendrai pas tout le poëme entier d'un bout à l'autre.

Je hazarde, Monsieur! de présenter dans votre bibliotheque un morceau de mes faibles essais, que je vous prie de vouloir bien accepter comme une marque de mon estime pour vos talents, et de reconnaissance pour le plaisir que la lecture de *Marmion* m'a donné.

J'aurai desiré de rendre votre belle poësie dans ma langue native. Les travaux ne m'en auraient pas détourné. Une seule crainte m'arrête: C'est d'obscurcir les beautés et de nuir au genie!

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec la consideration la plus parfaite,

Monsieur.
Votre très humble servante
ANNA BOUNINA

L'an 1817
Ce le 8 de Mars
Margate

This is probably the earliest extant Russian letter to Scott and a proof of Scott's early popularity in Russia. Anna Bunina was the first Russian woman poet of importance; at the time she enjoyed a considerable reputation, her contemporaries often referring to her as the "Russian Sappho." She belonged to the conservative antiromantic school in literature, but this did not prevent her, as we can see, from becoming enthusiastic over Scott's *Marmion* and wishing to translate it.

In 1815 Bunina went to England to recuperate after a serious illness; Emperor Alexander took upon himself the expenses of her trip. She wrote her letter while undergoing a cure at Margate.

BARON ALEXANDER MEYENDORFF TO SIR WALTER SCOTT

MONSIEUR LE BARON,

Il y a environ un an que j'étais sous les toits hospitaliers d'Abbotsfort. Vous vous en souviendrez a peine et moi je ne l'oublierai jamais. Parmi les choses excellentes que m'offrait Sir Walter et qui rappelaient tant ce que l'on sait de l'antique hospitalité écossaise, je remarquoi avec plaisir le *whisky*. J'en portais mêmes par Vos ordres une bouteille à Madame Lockhart à Londres. Revenu dans ma bonne Livonie au milieu de nos sables, de nos sapins en vue de ces ruines qui disent notre puissance passée et notre insuffisance actuelle je me souvenais toujours avec plaisir de ces deux jours passés si bien avec Sir Walter. Il faut me disais-je qu'il goute *notre whisky* et que nous lui procurions un instant de plaisir pour les jouissances sans nombre que nous lui devons. C'est ains que je me vois [*indecipherable*] de Vous envoyer le paquet ci-joint addressé à Votre libraire. Si ce whisky vous plait, je Vous prie de penser qu'en Angleterre le roi seul en boit. J'en fait toujours venir de Riga pour sa table.

Depuis que je Vous ai quitté—j'ai beaucoup voyagé—j'ai été errer sur les bords du Wolga, de la Seine, maintenant je retourne à Paris où je suis placé près du Général Pozzo. J'y rentrerai avec ma femme pour quelque temps à poste fixe. Je ne Vous dis pas cela pour que Vous m'écriviez, Dieu préserve. J'espère bien que Vous me traiterez comme nous traitons tous Sir John Sinclair qui écrit à tout le monde et auquel personne ne répond.

La Russie tranquille maintenant au dehors se developpe majestueusement dans le jour de la civilisation; c'est un beau spectacle que 50 millions d'individus qui s'avancent rapidement dans la carrière d'une véritable civilisation. Vous devriez venir voir un moment ce spectacle. Je n'ai pas besoin de dire comme Vous seriez reçu. On sait être reconnoissant en Russie et surtout à Moscou. Je trouve partout un enthousiasme pour l'écosse qui Vous ferait plaisir.

Je veux que ces lignes Vous trouvent bien portant gai comme je Vous ai vu dans nos promenades au milieu des Votres, le beau tems vous aura ramené de Londres Mrs Lockart et les petits enfants.

Puissiez Vous jouir longtems d'un bonheur que Vous souhaitent les habitants de l'un et de l'autre monde et permettez à un descendant des anciens porte-glaives de Livonie de venir frapper un de ces jours aux portes du chateau d'Abbotsford. C'est du fond de mon cœur que je Vous demande un souvenir bienveillant à un de Vos plus chauds admirateurs.

LE BARON A. DE MEYENDORFF

Riga le 20 Juin
1830

P.S. Je me rejouirai beaucoup de venir voir Vos arbres croissants sous l'œil

du maitre. Savez Vous que depuis bien longtems nous déplantons et replantons de vieux arbres, mais tout ce que Vous nous avez dit récemment là dessus nous a fait le plus grand plaisir.

The author of this letter, Baron Alexander Meyendorff (1798-1865), came of a noble Baltic family. His father was a general in the Russian army. He studied at the Lycée Impérial at Metz; served with the engineering troops; was attached to various missions abroad; occupied various posts in the Ministry of Finance; and became president of the Manufacturing Council of Moscow. He was interested in the development of Russia's productive forces and accompanied the famous English geologist Murchison in his expedition to the Urals. In 1829 he visited Scott at Abbotsford. In his diary Scott gives the following account of this visit: "Arrived to breakfast one of the Courland nobility, Baron A. von Meyersdorff [*sic*], a fine, lively, spirited young man, fond of his country and incensed at its degradation under Russia. He talked much of the orders of chivalry who had been feudal lords of Livonia, especially the order of Porte Glaive, to which his own ancestors had belonged. If he report correctly, there is a deep principle of action at work in Germany, Poland, Russia, etc., which, if it does not 'die in thinking,' will one day make an explosion. The Germans are a nation, however, apt to exhaust themselves in speculation. The Baron has enthusiasm, and is well read in English and foreign literature . . ."[32]

Meyendorff informed Scott of the death of an old Russian friend of his, Princess Galitzin (Golitsyn), who in 1826 entertained both Scott and Fenimore Cooper in Paris, and at whose request the well-known Russian artist, Alexander Brüllow, made a portrait of Scott which Scott's daughter thought to be a very good likeness.[33]

It is interesting that Meyendorff served as an intermediary between Scott and Goethe, on one hand, and Alfred de Vigny, on the other. In Vigny's diary for May 1829 we read: "Ce mois-ci, M. de Meyendorff, colonel russe, est venu me voir avec Edouard Lagrange, mon ami. Il a vu Sir Walter Scott à Edimbourg. Walter Scott l'a prié de me voir et de dire qu'il ne lisait d'autre livre français que *Cinq-Mars*.

"Il n'y trouve qu'un défaut; c'est que le peuple ne tient pas assez de place. Il croit que notre peuple est aussi pittoresque que le sien,—et notre public aussi patient à supporter les conversations populaires; il se trompe. Son Ecosse s'intéresse à chacune de ses montagnes, la France aime-t-elle toutes ses provinces?"[34]

---

[32] *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott: 1829-32* (with a preface by W. M. Parker) (Edinburgh & London, 1946), pp. 41-42.

[33] For a fuller account of Scott's relations with Princess Galitzin, see my article cited in note 10 *supra*.

[34] *Œuvres complètes de Alfred de Vigny: Le Journal d'un poète*, tome premier (1823-1841), notes et éclaircissements de Fernand Baldensperger (Paris, 1935),

Three years later, in 1832, Vigny wrote in his diary: "J'ai eu la visite d'un aide de camp de l'empereur Nicolas, le Baron de Meyendorff, qui m'a dit que Goethe lui avait parlé de moi avec admiration plusieurs fois.—Sa jeune femme me l'a répété, Goethe lui avait donné la curiosité de me voir. Walter Scott lui avait dit aussi qu'il lisait peu de choses en français mais qu'il avait lu tous mes ouvrages avec transport."[35]

In 1828 another Russian visitor to Scott, Alexander Turgenev, who for many years served as a kind of ambassador-at-large of Russian culture in foreign parts and who knew all the literary notabilities of his time, including Goethe, Chateaubriand, Stendhal, Mérimée, and Southey, went on from Abbotsford to Weimar and probably gave Goethe a firsthand account of Scott. The letter which Turgenev wrote Scott from Keswick, where he was visiting Southey to whom he spoke of Russian translations of his work by Zhukovsky and Kozlov, is also preserved in the Walpole collection.[36]

University of California, Berkeley

pp. 55-56. M. Baldensperger calls Meyendorff "Pierre," confusing him with his brother. The letter here printed proves that it was Alexander Meyendorff who visited Scott and Vigny.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 168. Baldensperger comments as follows upon this entry: "C'est certainement 'sans transport,' et même avec une certaine défiance, que Goethe, adversaire secret mais convaincu de la Restauration, lisait *Cinq-Mars* le 25 mars 1830 et le 31 juillet 1831."

[36] For Turgenev's letter and details of his visit to Abbotsford, see my article, "A Russian Traveller in Scotland in 1828: Alexander Turgenev," *Blackwood's Magazine*, Nov. 1945.

A GENERAL SURVEY OF RENAISSANCE PETRARCHISM

ERNEST H. WILKINS

THE FIELD of Renaissance Petrarchism is so vast that it would take a series of volumes to cover it adequately. My purpose, in the present article, is simply to attempt a very general survey of the field, hoping thereby to throw some helpful light on some of the main trends, groupings, and relationships that appear within it.

The word "Petrarchism" may properly be used, if the widest possible application is desired, to mean "productive activity in literature, art, or music under the direct or indirect influence of the writings of Petrarch, the expression of admiration for him, and the study of his works and of their influence." The word may properly be used, also, in a large variety of more or less restricted meanings.

After a brief survey of the general features of literary activity under the influence of Petrarch during the Renaissance, I shall limit the scope of this article to consideration of the influence of Petrarch on Renaissance lyric verse.

The writings of Petrarch may be classified thus: (1) the Latin works; (2) the *Triumphs*; (3) the *Canzoniere*.

The Latin works constitute more than nine-tenths of Petrarch's total production. The main individual works are, in verse, the *Africa*, the *Bucolicum carmen*, and the *Epistolae metricae*, and, in prose, the *Epistolae*, the *De viris illustribus*, the *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, and the *Secretum*.

The *Triumphs* consist of several *capitoli* in *terza rima* celebrating, in general processionally, the triumphs of Love, Chastity, Death, Fame, Time, and Eternity. Most of the hundreds of persons mentioned are classic; but the poem is comfortably mediaeval in its general character.

The *Canzoniere* is Petrarch's own selective and ordered collection of his Italian lyrics. His own title for it was *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta;* it is sometimes called *Le rime sparse*, and sometimes simply *Le rime*. Most of the poems of the *Canzoniere* are love poems; but there are many others—among them some of the noblest and most impressive of all—that deal with patriotic or religious themes. There exist also, outside the *Canzoniere*, some Italian lyrics that are certainly by Petrarch, and a

good many that may or may not be his.[1] Most of the poems of the *Canzoniere* are sonnets, but the collection contains also twenty-eight *canzoni*, several *sestine*, and a few *ballate* and *madrigali*. Petrarch regarded the *canzone* as the supreme lyric form.

If Petrarch had been asked to appraise the three divisions of his work, as distinguished above, he would certainly have given first place to the Latin works, and would almost certainly have given second place to the *Triumphs*.

From each of the three divisions there proceeded, beginning in Petrarch's lifetime, a specific wave of influence. While these waves were virtually simultaneous in respect to their time of origin, they were by no means equal in their original strength or in their periods of greatest strength. Generally speaking, the first wave, in point of original strength and in respect to the time when it reached its peak, was the wave that proceeded from the Latin works; next came the wave from the *Triumphs*; and last the wave from the *Canzoniere*.

In Italy the wave from the Latin works reached its peak in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, diminished thereafter, and virtually disappeared in the seventeenth century. The wave from the *Triumphs* reached its peak in the fifteenth century, diminished thereafter, and virtually disappeared in the sixteenth century. The wave from the *Canzoniere*, of lesser strength, until the latter part of the fifteenth century, than the wave from the *Triumphs*, thereafter gained strength swiftly, rose to a tremendous peak in the sixteenth century, and has diminished gradually since that time, though occasionally resurgent and still existent.[2]

In other European countries the order of the three divisions in respect to influence was, broadly speaking, the same. The three waves overlap; but, in terms of the times of original impact and of peak of interest, the wave from the Latin works generally came first, the wave from the *Triumphs* next, and the wave from the *Canzoniere* last.

From this point on I shall limit my attention to the third wave—redefining Renaissance Petrarchism, accordingly, as "the writing of lyric verse under the direct or indirect influence of Petrarch in a period beginning in his lifetime and ending about 1600."

---

[1] These poems, called *rime disperse* or *rime estravaganti*, are far less important than the *Canzoniere*, but they should not be disregarded in any serious study of Petrarchism, especially since a few of them are included as addenda in a good many sixteenth-century editions of the *Canzoniere*.

[2] Most fourteenth- and fifteenth-century MSS of the Italian poems of Petrarch contain both the *Triumphs* and the *Canzoniere*: but among the many that contain only one of the two works those that contain the *Triumphs* are far more numerous than those that contain the *Canzoniere*. Similarly, most fifteenth-century editions of the Italian poems of Petrarch contain both works; but, while there are several separate editions of the *Triumphs*, there is no separate edition of the *Canzoniere*.

The main manifestations of Renaissance Petrarchism are the use of Petrarchan words, phrases, lines, metaphors, conceits, and ideas, and the adoption, for poetic purposes, of the typical Petrarchan experiences and attitudes. In countries other than Italy, Petrarchism manifests itself also in translations and paraphrases. Among the poets who were in some sense Petrarchistic there is wide variation with respect to the intensity of their Petrarchism. Some are subservient and purely imitative; some, though they make use of Petrarchan materials, have something of their own to say; and there are some in whose verse the Petrarchistic elements are merely secondary and incidental.

Most of the headings of the numbered sections of the rest of this survey begin with the name of just one poet. The men whose names are thus selected are in general either the initiators or the most notable representatives of the phase of Petrarchism concerned; in all such cases, however—except that of Chaucer—it is to be understood that other poets were also writing Petrarchistic verse in the same period. It is to be understood, also, that in many cases activity on the part of some members of the group of poets concerned continued into a period following that in which most of their work was done.

Petrarchism began, of course, in Italy; and we may first consider its development in its homeland.

Italian Petrarchism

(1) Boccaccio: The Middle of the Fourteenth Century. By making use of two of the sonnets of Petrarch in certain stanzas of the *Filostrato*, which he wrote about 1340, Boccaccio—always a devotee of Petrarch—qualified as the first Petrarchist. In Boccaccio's own lyrics the influence of Petrarch appears merely as one of three strains, the other two being the influence of Dante and that of other poets of the *Dolce stil nuovo*. The same triple influence persists in other Italian poets of the fourteenth century.

(2) Minor Poets of the First Half of the Fifteenth Century. In Giusto de' Conti and some of his contemporaries the influence of Petrarch became dominant; these men, themselves quite uninspired, are the first group of thoroughgoing Petrarchists.

(3) Boiardo: The Second Half of the Fifteenth Century. Boiardo and Lorenzo de' Medici, the major lyrists of this period, both derived much from Petrarch; but their own lyric gifts enabled them to absorb and re-create what they derived. Boiardo, close to Petrarch, is nevertheless a fine and spirited poet in his own right. Lorenzo's Petrarchism is held to the status of a resource to be drawn upon or disregarded at his princely pleasure. Other writers—among them Pico

della Mirandola, disappointingly feeble as lyrist—represent subservient Petrarchism.

(4) Il Chariteo: The Late Fifteenth Century. None of the poets of the first three periods of Italian Petrarchism had any considerable influence on the later lyric, Italian or foreign; but in the last decades of the fifteenth century there developed a new phase of Petrarchism which was destined to have great influence, both in Italy and abroad. The responsibility for the initiation of this new phase lies with the Catalan Benedicto Gareth, who came to Naples in his early youth and became, to all intents and purposes, an Italian; he was known, in Italy, as Il Chariteo. Petrarch himself, from time to time, indulges in conceits, antitheses, and other rhetorical devices—which, however, constitute a secondary group of characteristics within the general body of his rich and beautiful and living verse. Il Chariteo—though by no means without artistic gifts of his own—devotes too much attention to these rhetorical devices, and exploits them energetically. His cardinal and most infectious sin is the materialization of Petrarchan metaphors, to which he gives an existential literality they were never meant to bear. His two chief companions and followers in flamboyance were Tebaldeo and the devastatingly popular Serafino dell'Aquila. Others whose verse, though in itself insignificant, proved to be very influential were Sasso and Filosseno. The Chariteans, especially Serafino, made extensive use of the eight-line *strambotto*—a form not found in Petrarch.

(5) Bembo: The First Half of the Sixteenth Century. From the flamboyant aberration Italian lyrism was rescued, for the time being, by the Venetian patrician, Pietro Bembo, of whom an admirer wrote:

> Che se non eri tu mastron di tutti,
> Tutti sariemo stati Tebaldei!

Bembo, in his attainment and lordly exercise of literary dictatorship, was to the Italian sixteenth century what Malherbe was to the early French seventeenth century and Dr. Johnson to the late English eighteenth. Partly because he was a humanist, and partly because his own creative gift was very slight, the main literary law he announced was that of imitation; and in the field of Italian poetry the one adequate and compulsory object of imitation was Petrarch. So Bembo himself wrote imitative Petrarchistic verse, with extreme fidelity, impeccable good taste, and not much else. In his train hosts of Italian poets and poetesses strove to imitate Petrarch—or Bembo—or each other. Among them were Alamanni, Ariosto, Caro, Castiglione, Vittoria Colonna, Della Casa, Veronica Gambara, Guidiccioni, Molza, Navagero, Sannazaro, and Bernardo Tasso. Castiglione and Guidiccioni wrote admirable patriotic verse—still within the Petrarchan tradition. The one great

Italian lyrist of this period, Michelangelo, made some use of Petrarchan material in his highly individual poetry, but he never bowed the knee to Bembo—or to anyone else.

The sixteenth century saw the prolific production of two kinds of books that were influential both for contemporary and for later Petrarchism: editions of the *Canzoniere* and lyric anthologies. More than 130 editions of the *Canzoniere* were published in Italy in the course of the century. Some of them contained the text alone; others contained voluminous commentaries, among which that of Vellutello was the one most frequently reprinted. In 1545 the enterprising Venetian publisher, Giolito, brought out a well-made little volume entitled *Rime diverse di molti eccellentiss. Auttori nuovamente raccolte, Libro primo.* About a hundred poets, most of them Petrarchistic in the Bembist sense, were represented in this volume, some by one or two poems only, some by several or by many poems. The success of this anthology led Giolito and a number of rival publishers to print many similar volumes. In the earlier anthologies poetry of the Bembist type predominated.

(6) The Neapolitans: The Middle Sixteenth Century. Toward the middle of the century there appeared in Italy a new lyric movement which was in part a reaction against the puristic restraint of Bembo, in part a reversion to the flamboyance of the Chariteans, and in part a manifestation of true lyric energy. The leaders of this movement were—like Il Chariteo—men of the Neapolitan region: Angelo di Costanzo, Rota, Tansillo, and Galeazzo di Tarsia. Fortunately, they were better poets than the Chariteans. Their flamboyance was in general less violent; they retained something of Bembo's stylistic carefulness; and some of them, at least, were more distinctive than either the Chariteans or the Bembists in their poetic experiences and utterances. Tansillo, the best Italian lyrist between Michelangelo and Tasso, is notably successful as a poet of nature. The verse of these men was made known chiefly in some of the later anthologies, first in the *Rime di diversi illustri napoletani et d'altri nobiliss. intelletti, nuovamente raccolte e non piu stampate, Terzo libro,* published by Giolito in 1552, but most emphatically in *I fiori delle rime de' poeti illustri nuovamente raccolti et ordinati,* published by Sessa in 1558.

(7) Torquato Tasso: The Second Half of the Sixteenth Century. Tasso's 2,000 lyrics are similar, on the whole, to those of the Neapolitans; but the best of them shine with an inner and an outer beauty denied to lesser men.

Marino, through whom the returning Chariteanism was to attain the still more startling triumphs of Marinism, began the writing of his lyrics before 1600; but their publication and their influence belong to the history of the following century.

From Italy Petrarchism spread westward into Catalonia, the rest of Spain, Portugal, and France; northward into England, Scotland, the Netherlands, and Germany; and eastward into Dalmatia, Hungary, Poland, and Cyprus. We may now survey its development in each of these regions.

Catalan Petrarchism

Toward the end of the fourteenth century Lorenz Mallol imitated Petrarch's *canzone* beginning "S'i' 'l dissi mai"; and early in the fifteenth century Jordi de Sent Jordi paraphrased Petrarch's sonnet "Pace non trovo." The chief Catalan lyrist of the fifteenth century, Ausias March, is regarded by some scholars as an imitator of Petrarch; others believe that the resemblances in the poems of the two men are due to independent derivations, direct or indirect, from the Provençal lyric.

Spanish Petrarchism

(1) The Marquis of Santillana: The Middle Fifteenth Century. The forty-two sonnets *fechos al itálico modo* in 1444 and thereafter by the Marquis of Santillana are of interest as constituting the first instance of Spanish Petrarchism. The Marquis, however, poet though he proved himself in other writings, did not, in these sonnets, attain either smoothness of form or distinction in content; and they did not serve to establish a Petrarchistic tradition in Spain.

(2) Boscán: The First Half of the Sixteenth Century. The early years of the sixteenth century, made distressful for Italy by French and Spanish invasions and by Franco-Spanish conflicts in Italy, were inevitably years in which many warring French and Spanish courtiers received an immediate and impressive revelation of Italian culture. Among the Spaniards thus impressed were Boscán and Garcilaso de la Vega, both of whom served in Italy. But the torch of Petrarchism was passed to Boscán, not in Italy, but after his return to Spain. In Granada, in 1526, he met the Venetian ambassador Navagero, humanist and poet; and Spanish Petrarchism, as an effective and continuing movement, stems directly from their conversation.[3]

[3] In the dedicatory letter of his *Sonetos y canciones a manera de los italianos*, Boscán writes thus of his conversation with Navagero and its consequences:

"Porque estando un día en Granada con el Navagero ... tratando con él en cosas de ingenio y letras, me dixo por qué no probaba en lengua Castellana Sonetos y otras artes de trovas usadas por los buenos autores de Italia; y no solamente me lo dixo así livianamente, mas aun me rogó que lo hiciese. Partíme pocos días después para mi casa, y con la largueza y soledad del camino discurriendo por diversas cosas, fuí á dar muchas veces en lo que el Navagero me había dicho; y así comencé á tentar este género de verso. En el qual al principio hallé alguna dificultad, por ser muy artificioso y tener muchas particularidades diferentes del nuestro. Pero después pareciéndome, quizá con el amor de las cosas propias, que esto comenzaba á sucederme bien, fuí poco á poco metiéndome en calor con ello."

The Petrarchistic results of Boscán's experiment were a hundred sonnets and *canciones,* based chiefly on the poems of Petrarch himself, but with some minor Bembist reflections. They have little poetic value; but they gave a new and enduring orientation to the Spanish lyric. Boscán (whose prose was better than his verse) translated the *Cortegiano.* His comrade in arms and in verse, Garcilaso de la Vega, darling of the annals of Spanish heroism, exemplified the perfect courtier. Bembo called him the best-loved Spaniard who ever came to Italy. Garcilaso's Petrarchan poems, not very numerous, are of a refined and idyllic beauty that has proved to be perennial in its charm. Petrarch was his main model; but he shows acquaintance also with the poems of Sannazaro and of the young Tansillo. It was presumably the character of the Italian poets whom they came to know personally that saved Boscán and Garcilaso from the Charitean infection. The Petrarchistic tradition thus initiated was presently confirmed by the example of the humanistic diplomat, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who wrote a number of Petrarchistic sonnets.

(3) Herrera: The Second Half of the Sixteenth Century. The writers of this period constitute a varied group, distinguished from their predecessors not only in date but by the fact that these later poets made extensive use of the Italian lyric anthologies of the middle of the century. Cetina and Acuña, soldiers both, linked the earlier and later groups.[4] Fray Luis de León, the noblest Spanish poet of his time, translated poems by Petrarch and by Bembo; but his Petrarchism was hardly more than incidental. The outstanding and most influential Petrarchist of the group was Fernando de Herrera, whose verse, replete with Petrarchistic phrases and images, is spirited and magniloquent.

Portuguese Petrarchism

(1) The Cancioneiro geral: The Late Fifteenth Century and the Early Sixteenth. Petrarchan influence makes its first Portuguese appearance in a few of the thousand poems of this very miscellaneous collection, put together by Garcia de Resende.

(2) Sá de Miranda: The First Half of the Sixteenth Century. Sá de Miranda, humanist and courtier, the first noteworthy Portuguese Petrarchist, spent some time, in and after 1521, in Italy, where he probably came to know Bembo, Ariosto, Sannazaro, and Vittoria Colonna. He was an enthusiastic admirer of Boscán and Garcilaso. He wrote Petrarchistic poems both in Portuguese and in Spanish, and in some cases acknowledged his source by the notation *feita seguindo*

[4] Cetina came to the New World. He was killed while serenading in Los Angeles on Apr. 1, 1554.

Petrarca. But his Petrarchism, partly direct, is also mediated in part by Boscán and Garcilaso. Sá de Miranda was followed by a considerable group of Petrarchistic poets, among whom Ferreira was the most vocal.

(3) CAMÕES: THE SECOND HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Camões, great by reason of his lyrics as well as by reason of his epic, manifests a thorough and appreciative acquaintance with Petrarch. He made extensive use of both the sonnet and *canzone* forms. Several of his poems reflect particular Petrarchan poems, and many others are in some measure Petrarchistic in their content. He shows knowledge also of the poetry of Bembo. Camões, like Sá de Miranda, was followed by a group of minor Petrarchists.

French Petrarchism

(1) MAROT: THE FIRST HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Unlike Boscán, Garcilaso, and Sá de Miranda, the first French imitators of Italian verse took as their main models not Petrarch and the Bembists, but the Chariteans, especially Serafino; and the form they chiefly imitated was not the sonnet but the *strambotto*. And, whereas the Iberians had some personal acquaintance with Bembo and the Bembists, the transmission of the Charitean influence to the French poets was a matter of the printed page; Il Chariteo and Serafino had died long before Marot first went to Italy, and Tebaldeo, though still alive at that time, had long outlived his poetic self. Petrarchan and Bembist influence, however, is not absent. Marot translated seven of the poems of Petrarch, six sonnets and one *canzone*, "Standomi un giorno solo a la fenestra," the *canzone* of the six visions. Marot's translation of this poem is headed: "Des visions de Petrarque." Saint-Gelais, who occasionally shows direct knowledge of Petrarch, Bembo, and Sannazaro, wrote several sonnets. Scève, when he rose above his Chariteans, was more Platonic than Petrarchistic.

In 1545 Jean de Tournes published at Lyons an edition of the Italian text of the poems of Petrarch.[5] This edition was reprinted in 1547 and 1550. In the latter year another Lyonese publisher, Roville, brought out a similar edition, of which reprints or revisions appeared in 1551, 1558, 1564, and 1574.

(2) THE PLÉIADE: THE MIDDLE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Du Bellay

[5] The dedicatory letter, addressed to Scève, tells the story of Scève's opening in Avignon, in 1533, of a tomb which he claimed to be the tomb of Laura. Modern criticism dismisses his evidence and questions his sincerity; but in any case he provided pleasant Petrarchistic thrills for his contemporaries, including Francis I, who visited the tomb and composed an epitaph, first printed by Tournes in his Petrarch of 1545, beginning

"En petit lieu compris vous pouez voir."

refers to Petrarch five times in *La Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse* (1548), most notably in this passage:

> Sonne moy ces beaux sonnetz, non moins docte que plaisante invention italienne, conforme de nom à l'ode, et differente d'elle seulement pource que le sonnet a certains vers reiglez et limitez, et l'ode peut courir par toutes manieres de vers librement ... Pour le sonnet donques tu as Petrarque et quelques modernes Italiens.

There is also a laudatory reference to Bembo.

The publication of the *Deffence* was followed by a spate of Petrarchistic lyrics. In the preface to the first edition (1549) of the *Olive* Du Bellay states frankly that he has used Italian models. Of the 115 sonnets of the second edition (1550), the majority are derived—some almost literally, some freely—from Italian sources: about ten from Petrarch, about twenty from Ariosto, and about thirty from the first two Bembist anthologies. The *Erreurs amoureuses* of Tyard (1549) are modelled mainly on Scève and the Chariteans. Ronsard, Baïf, and Magny, in their respective *Amours* (1552, 1552, and 1553), find their models most frequently in Petrarch, Bembo, and the first two Bembist anthologies—Ronsard re-creating whatever he touches. In the collections published by Baïf and Ronsard in 1555 and 1556, however, there are intrusions of Charitean influence. Du Bellay's *Antiquitez de Rome* (1558), written after his return from a four years' stay in Italy, echoes certain patriotic poems of Petrarch and the Bembists. To the *Antiquitez* Du Bellay added, under the title *Songe ou vision sur Rome*, a series of fifteen sonnets in which he follows the general idea, but not the content, of Petrarch's *canzone* of the six visions.

In these same years Vasquin Philieul, a jurist of Carpentras, produced a verse translation of the Italian poems of Petrarch—first, in 1548, a collection of about 200 hundred translations, under the title *Laure d'Avignon*, and finally, in 1555, *Toutes les euvres vulgaires de Françoys Petrarque*.

(3) Desportes: The Second Half of the Sixteenth Century. Olivier de Magny, who had been in Italy at the same time as Du Bellay, brought back, in his *Soupirs*, a very different type of influence; for, though a few of the poems of this collection reflect poems of Petrarch and some of the Bembists, the main influence is that of the Chariteans—an influence resurgent, just then, in Italian Petrarchism. The same influence is dominant also in the sonnets of Belleau, and is discernible in the later verse of Ronsard. It is strong in Desportes as well; but Desportes drew heavily, also, upon Petrarch himself, and derived much from the Neapolitans—especially Angelo di Costanzo—and from other poets represented in the Italian lyric anthologies. With Bertaut the influence of the Chariteans fades out; the influence of the Neapolitans, especially that of Tansillo, becomes very strong; and the influence of

Torquato Tasso appears for the first time. *Enfin Malherbe vint*: but in his earliest poems he too is a follower of the Neapolitans and of Tasso.

Flemish Petrarchism

VAN DER NOOT: THE SECOND HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. The lyrics of Jan Van der Noot, the first Renaissance poet of the Netherlands, were strongly influenced by Marot and the poets of the Pléiade. He knew and admired the work of Petrarch, and translated two of his sonnets. He refers often to Boscán, an edition of whose poems was published in Antwerp in 1576; but it is not clear that he derived any poetic material from him. Van der Noot was an ardent Calvinist, and in 1567 had to take refuge in London. There, in 1568, he brought out an antipapal tract with a long title beginning *Het Theatre oft Toon-neel.* To the prose body of the tract he prefixed, as texts, three poems: first, under the heading "Epigrammen," a translation, based in part on the Italian and in part on Marot's version, of Petrarch's *canzone* of the six visions; second, under the heading "Sonnetten naar du Bellay," a translation of eleven of the fifteen sonnets of Du Bellay's *Songe*—which, as has been noted, was patterned on the same Petrarchan *canzone*; and third, four similar stanzas of his own, based on the Apocalypse. Each stanza or sonnet is illustrated by an engraving.[6] He brought out, in the same year, a French edition of the *Theatre,* in which the poems of Marot and Du Bellay appear in their original French, and, in the following year, an English edition, entitled in part, *A Theatre wherein be represented . . . the miseries & calamities that follow the voluptuous Worldlings*; this English edition will be referred to presently. Three years later a German edition was published in Cologne; the poems were translated, from the Flemish, by one Balthasar Froe.

English Petrarchism

(1) CHAUCER: THE LATE FOURTEENTH CENTURY. Chaucer's "Cantus Troili"—lines 400-420 of Book I of the *Troilus and Criseyde,* which was completed in the period 1385-87—is a close adaptation of Petrarch's sonnet "S'amor non è."

(2) WYATT: THE FIRST HALF OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Sir Thomas Wyatt, who visited Italy in 1527, returned to England with a considerable knowledge of Petrarch and a determination to imitate him. Among Wyatt's hundred poems there are some thirty sonnets—the first English sonnets. About twenty-five of his poems are derived wholly or in part from Petrarch, several being translations; the Petrarchan poems concerned include *canzoni* as well as sonnets. Wyatt makes use of Pe-

[6] These engravings have their importance in the history of emblem books. They reappear in the French, English, and German editions of the *Theatre.*

trarchan poems not only in his sonnets but also in several of the poems he wrote in other forms. One of his sonnets is a translation of a sonnet by Sannazaro. Wyatt's versification is very rough. The Earl of Surrey, a junior contemporary and a great admirer of Wyatt, was much more successful in his adaptation of Italian forms. About half of his two-score poems are sonnets. A few of them are translations or adaptations of particular Petrarchan poems; more of them—some sonnets, some in other forms—show brief Petrarchan borrowings.[7] The poems of Wyatt and Surrey were first published, posthumously, in 1557, in Tottel's *Miscellany*, which opens with these words, addressed by "The Printer to the Reader":

> That to haue wel written in verse, yea & in small parcelles, deserueth great praise, the workes of diuers Latines, Italians, and other, doe proue sufficiently. That our tong is able in that kynde to do as praiseworthely as y rest, the honorable stile of the noble earle of Surrey, and the weightinesse of the depewitted sir Thomas Wyat the elders verse, with seuerall graces in sondry good Englishe writers, doe show abundantly.

The poems of Wyatt and Surrey make up about two-thirds of the collection, which contains also about a hundred poems by "Vncertain auctours."[8] A few contain Petrarchan borrowings. Two of these poems are entitled respectively "A praise of Petrarke and of Lawra his ladie" and "That Petrark cannot be passed but notwithstanding that Laura is far surpassed." The first of the two is worth quotation:

> *O* Petrarke hed and prince of poets all,
> Whose liuely gift of flowyng eloquence,
> Wel may we seke, but finde not how or whence
> So rare a gift with thee did rise and fall,
> Peace to thy bones, and glory immortall
> Be to thy name, and to her excellence.
> Whose beauty lighted in thy time and sence
> So to be set forth as none other shall.
> Why hath not our pens rimes so parfit wrought
> Ne why our time forth bringeth beauty such
> To trye our wittes as golde is by the touche,
> If to the stile the matter aided ought.
> But ther was neuer Laura more than one,
> And her had petrarke for his paragone.

(3) The Early Elizabethans: The Second Half of the Sixteenth Century. Gascoigne (who owned a copy of the edition of Petrarch with the Gesualdo commentary published by Giglio in 1552) and other early Elizabethans occasionally wrote sonnets and occasionally

[7] The general parallelism between the Spanish pair, Boscán and Garcilaso, and the English pair, Wyatt and Surrey, is extraordinarily close.

[8] A similar section of poems by *incerti autori* appears in the Giolito anthology of 1547—the *Rime di diversi nobili huomini . . . Libro secondo.*

used Petrarchistic material. Some of their poems are translations or imitations from the French Petrarchists. In the English edition of Van der Noot's *Theatre* the stanzas that represent Petrarch's *canzone* are headed "Epigrams": the first and third are sonnets; the others, also rhymed, are of twelve lines. The sonnets taken from Du Bellay's *Songe* and those on the Apocalypse are headed "Sonets": each consists of fourteen lines in blank verse. The first two poems—and presumably the third—were translated directly from the French. It seems probable that these translations were made by Spenser, though he was then only 16 or 17 years old. The *Complaints . . . by Ed. Sp.* published in 1591 contains as its last two items "The Visions of Bellay" and "The Visions of Petrarch formerly translated." The text of the "Visions of Petrarch" corresponds *verbatim* to that of the translation in the *Theatre*, except for a few minor variants and the fact that the twelve-line stanzas are now extended to sonnet length by expansion of the concluding lines. The text of the "Visions of Bellay" corresponds in a great many phrases to that of the translation in the *Theatre*, but is in rhymed sonnets, and includes the four sonnets of the *Songe* that were not included in the *Theatre*. Spenser translated also the *Antiquitez de Rome*, as "Ruines of Rome: by Bellay"; and upon the *Antiquitez* he based his own "Ruines of Time."[9]

(4) The Later Elizabethans: The Late Sixteenth Century. The typical form of English lyric activity in the last two decades of the century was the writing of sonnet sequences. The first to be published was Watson's *Hecatompathia* (1582). Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*, published posthumously in 1591, was probably written in large part in 1582. The years 1592-1597 saw the publication of nearly a score of sequences; among the more notable are Daniel's *Delia* (1592), Constable's *Diana* (1592), Lodge's *Phillis* (1593), and Spenser's *Amoretti* (1595). Nearly all the sequences are, in varying degrees, Petrarchistic. The sources appear to be about equally Italian and French; the latest authors derive much also from their immediate English predecessors. The Italian sources include Petrarch, Il Chariteo and the Chariteans, Bembo and the Bembists, the Neapolitans, and Tasso. Many of the Italian poems in question seem to have become known through the Italian lyric anthologies. The French sources include Scève, the

[9] The Harvard copy of the edition of Petrarch with the commentary of Vellutello published by Griffio in 1554 was owned by an Englishman at least as early as 1574. That date is written on f. 62^{v}, beside the first line of the sonnet "Ben sapeva io." On f. 89^{r} the entire sonnet "S' una fede amorosa" is underlined, and above it is written the date "9· ffe: 1577." There are many marginal translations in a slightly later hand: on f. 1^{v}, for instance, *guai* is translated as "sorowes"; on f. 3^{r} *s'agghiaccia* is translated as "waxeth colde"; and on f. 205^{v} *speglio* is translated as "mirrour or looking glasse."

Pléiade, and Desportes. All of the English sonneteers are more or less eclectic. Desportes is a favorite source for Constable, Ronsard for Lodge, and Tasso for Spenser.

No convincing evidences of specific Petrarchistic derivation are to be found (though there has been much seeking) in the sonnets of Shakespeare.

Scotch Petrarchism

Several Scotch poets, in the last decades of the century, wrote verse in which there is a Petrarchistic strain. Alexander Montgomery and some others wrote in Scotch; the Earl of Stirling and others wrote in English. Their sources, naturally enough, are mainly French, but some use is made of Petrarch and of Italian Petrarchists, and there are some borrowings from English contemporaries.

German Petrarchism

Aside from Balthasar Froe's translation of Van der Noot's translation of Petrarch's *canzone* of the six visions, there is no certain evidence of any German use of the *Canzoniere* before 1601. The *Schönes Blumenfeldt* of Theobald Höck, published in that year, opens with a poem which is largely an adaptation of the opening sonnet of the *Canzoniere*; and there are a few more or less certain Petrarchan echoes in some of Höck's other poems.

Dalmatian Petrarchism

(1) Menčetić and Gjora Držić: The Late Fifteenth Century. These were the first two lyric poets of the thriving republic of Ragusa, which had close commercial and cultural relations with Italy. They took as models both Petrarch himself and their contemporary Chariteans, especially Serafino.

(2) Minor Poets of the First Half of the Sixteenth Century. A few poets of this period, some of them Ragusans, some from the Dalmatian islands, continued the Petrarchistic tradition. Bembo and Ariosto appear among the poets imitated.

(3) Ranjina: The Second Half of the Sixteenth Century. Ranjina, of a leading merchant family of Ragusa, came to Messina in 1559, lived there until 1563, and in those four years seems to have written most or all of his Croatian poems. The Chariteans, especially Serafino, were his early models. In 1563 he moved to Florence where, called Ragnina, he was warmly welcomed into literary society. His Croatian poems, *Piesni razlike*, were published in Florence in 1563. He then wrote a number of poems in Italian, taking as new models Petrarch,

Bembo, and some of the Neapolitans. Twenty-seven of his Italian sonnets were included in the 1565 edition of Giolito's *Secondo volume delle rime scelte di diversi eccellenti autori.* This was one of the favorite sources of Desportes; and three, at least, of the sonnets he derived from it are based upon sonnets by Ranjina. Zlatarić, a Ragusan poet of greater originality and distinction, adapted material from Petrarch, Bembo, some of the Bembists, and some of the Neapolitans. Several other men, including Marin Držić and Naljesković, wrote Petrarchistic verse in the same half-century.

Hungarian Petrarchism

The first great Hungarian lyric poet, Balassa, whose writing was done mainly in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, enriched his genuinely personal poems with elements drawn from many sources, among them the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch. The *Canzoniere* as a whole seems to have served Balassa as a model, in a very general sense, for his Julia cycle; and specific Petrarchan influences appear in certain poems.

Polish Petrarchism

The influence of Petrarch is present, though as a minor strain, among the many influences, largely classic, that affected the vigorous lyrics of the first great Polish poet, Kochanowski, who wrote in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Cypriote Petrarchism

A sixteenth-century MS now in the Library of St. Mark's contains a collection of some 200 poems in the Greek dialect of Cyprus. Twenty-two of these poems are sonnets, and these are in general Petrarchistic in form and content. Several are translations or adaptations of particular poems of the *Canzoniere.* In an adaptation of the sonnet "Quand' io veggio" the first, fifth, ninth, and twelfth lines of Petrarch's sonnet are incorporated in their Italian form. The name of the author is not known, but there is evidence that he was a man of culture and of noble family. The MS once belonged to the humanist Natale Conti.

Harvard University

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The bibliography of Petrarchism is, of course, vast. Many of the most important discussions are to be found in general histories of the literatures concerned, in editions of particular poets, and in books or articles dealing with particular poets. The following is a list of a few publications that deal with Petrarchism and (except in a very few cases) cover the works of more than one man.

Petrarchism (General)

C. Calcaterra, "Petrarca e il petrarchismo," in *Problemi ed orientamenti critici di*

lingua e di letteratura italiana, ed. A. Momigliano, III (Milan, 1949), 198-213, 253-273.

H. Hauvette, *Les Poésies lyriques de Pétrarque* (Paris, 1931), part II, "La Fortune des poésies de Pétrarque."

Italian Petrarchism

V. Cian, "Il maggior petrarchista del Cinquecento, Pietro Bembo," in R. Accademia Petrarca di Lettere Arti Scienze di Arezzo, *Annali della cattedra petrarchesca*, VIII (1938), 1-42.

G. G. Ferrero, *Il petrarchismo del Bembo e le rime di Michelangelo* (Turin, 1935).

A. Graf, *Attraverso il Cinquecento* (2nd ed., Turin, 1926), pp. 3-86, "Petrarchismo ed antipetrarchismo."

F. Rizzi, *L'anima del Cinquecento e la lirica volgare* (Milan, 1928).

L. Tonelli, *L'amore nella poesia e nel pensiero del rinascimento* (Florence, 1933), pp. 15-132, "La lirica."

H. Vaganay, *Le Sonnet en Italie et en France au XVI^e siècle* (Lyons, 1907).

J. Vianey, *op. cit.* below, under French Petrarchism.

Foreign Petrarchism (General)

A. Meozzi, *Azione e diffusione della letteratura italiana in Europa (sec. XV-XVII)* (Pisa, 1932-34). Vol. I, *Contatti di uomini e idee*; vol. II, part I, *Il petrarchismo europeo.*

Catalan Petrarchism

A. Farinelli, *Italia e Spagna* (Turin, 1929), I, 1-88, "Petrarca in Ispagna (nell'età media)."

A. Pagès, *Ausias March et ses prédécesseurs* (Paris, 1912).

B. Sanvisenti, *I primi influssi di Dante, del Petrarca, e del Boccacio sulla letteratura spagnuola* (Milan, 1902).

Spanish Petrarchism

A. Farinelli, *op. cit.*; also "Il Petrarca fra gli Ispani e i Lusitani," *Studi petrarcheschi*, I (1948), 225-239.

J. G. Fucilla, many articles, especially "Two Generations of Petrarchism and Petrarchists in Spain," *Modern Philology*, XXVII (1929-30), 277-295.

A. Meozzi, *Lirica della rinascita italiana in Spagna e Portogallo (sec. XV-XVII)* (Florence, 1943).

B. Sanvisenti, *op. cit.* above, under Catalan Petrarchism.

Portuguese Petrarchism

J. G. Fucilla, several articles, especially "A Miscellany of Portuguese Imitations," *Hispanic Review*, III (1935), 45-55.

A. Meozzi, *op. cit.* above, under Spanish Petrarchism.

G. C. Rossi, "La poesia del Petrarca in Portogallo," *Cultura neolatina*, III (1943), 175-190.

French Petrarchism

H. Chamard, *Histoire de la Pléiade*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1939-40).

F. Flamini, *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera* (Leghorn, 1895), pp. 197-381.

M. Françon, "Sur l'influence de Pétrarque en France aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles," *Italica*, XIX (1942), 105-110.

H. Gambier, *Italie et renaissance poétique en France* (Padua, 1936).

P. Laumonier, *Ronsard, poète lyrique* (Paris, 1909).

C. Pellegrini, "Il Petrarca nella cultura francese," *Rivista di letterature moderne*, I (1946), 75-84.

H. Vaganay, *op. cit.* above, under Italian Petrarchism.

J. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e siècle* (Montpellier, 1909).

Flemish Petrarchism

R. Galland, "Un Poète errant de la Renaissance: Jean Van der Noot et l'Angleterre," *Revue de Littérature comparée*, II (1922), 337-350.

A. Vermeylen, *Leven en Werken van Jonker Jan Van der Noot* (Antwerp, 1899).

Catharina Ypes, *Petrarca in de Nederlandse Letterkunde* (Amsterdam, 1934), pp. 35-69.

English Petrarchism

L. Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England* (3rd ed., New York, 1935), chap. VIII.

H. K. Hasselkuss, *Der Petrarkismus in der Sprache der englischen Sonettdichter der Renaissance* (Münster, 1927).

Lisle C. John, *The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences* (New York, 1938).

H. E. Rollins, ed., *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587)*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1928-29).

H. E. Rollins, ed., *The Sonnets*, in *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia and London, 1944), II, 125-132.

Janet G. Scott, *Les Sonnets élisabéthains* (Paris, 1929).

C. Segrè, *Relazioni letterarie fra Italia e Inghilterra* (Florence, 1911), pp. 53-159, "Due petrarchisti inglesi del secolo XVI."

Scotch Petrarchism

Janet G. Scott, *op. cit.* above, under English Petrarchism, chap. XV.

German Petrarchism

H. Souvageol, *Petrarka in der deutschen Lyrik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Anspach, 1911), pp. 1-9.

Dalmatian Petrarchism

A. Cronia, "La fortuna del Petrarca fra gli slavi meridionali," in R. Accademia Petrarca di Lettere Arti e Scienze di Arezzo, *Convegno petrarchesco dell'11-13 ottobre 1931*, part II (Arezzo, 1932), pp. 101-113; also "Il petrarchismo nel Cinquecento serbo-croato," *Studi petrarcheschi*, I (1948), 241-255.

M. Deanović, "Les Influences italiennes sur la littérature croate du littoral adriatique jusqu'à la fin du XVIII^e siècle," *Revue de Littérature comparée*, XIV (1934), 30-52.

G. Surdich, "'Traduzioni' dal Petrarca nell'antica letteratura serbo-croata di Dalmazia," *Studi petrarcheschi*, II (1949), 231-242.

J. Torbarina, *Italian Influences on the Poets of the Ragusan Republic* (London, 1931).

Hungarian Petrarchism

A. Eckhardt, "Valentino Balassa e Petrarca," *Corvina*, I (1921), 59-71.

Polish Petrarchism

M. Brahmer, *Petrarkizm w poezji XVI wieku* (Cracow, 1927).

J. Langlade, *Jean Kochanowski* (Paris, 1932).

Cypriote Petrarchism

A. Cosattini, "Un petrarchista greco," *Atene e Roma*, VII (1904), 115-120.

THE WISDOM AND FOLLY OF EDWARD BENLOWES

EDOUARD RODITI

IN THE preface to the poems of Edward Benlowes (1603-1676), reprinted for the first time in 1905 in the first volume of *Minor Caroline Poets*, George Saintsbury expressed regret that such an interesting poet, so maliciously ridiculed by Samuel Butler, Pope, and a few others in the age that followed that of the publication of *Theophila*, should have inspired, since the eighteenth century, only bibliographical research. Saintsbury, while recognizing some of our poet's absurdities, pointed out a few of the virtues of his verse which should appeal to a modern reader.

Saintsbury's scholarly reprint of this otherwise almost inaccessible poetry and his sympathetic introduction should have incited a few lovers of baroque and metaphysical verse, who have been so busily rediscovering its beauties after more than two centuries of neglect, to devote some time to a more thorough study of this interesting but obscure poet's techniques and beliefs. But Edward Benlowes has remained, in spite of Saintsbury's efforts and regrets, largely a topic of mere biographical or bibliographical study. Scholars and critics, such as George Williamson[1], who have devoted attention to his intellectual interests or his stylistic peculiarities are still outstanding exceptions to the general rule of neglect.

An informed appreciation of much of the poetry of the so-called metaphysical school of England requires considerable knowledge of the philosophical, religious, and scientific literature which had arisen or been revived throughout western Europe since the invention of printing. The metaphysical poets and their readers, with few exceptions, were scholarly men who read Latin and often also Greek, Italian, French, Spanish, or German, sometimes even, as did Crashaw's friend

[1] George Williamson, in *The Donne Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), is indeed the first critic and scholar, after Saintsbury, to discuss Benlowes sympathetically (pp. 175-181). He points out, for instance, that *Theophila* has "a glowing intensity" and "a profound sense of the immense space which surrounds human life." He also shows how Benlowes often improved the conceits that he borrowed from some of his contemporaries, and affirms that *Theophila* is "a remarkable example of the superb religious verse" of its age.

Joseph Beaumont, some Hebrew. Benlowes himself had made the "grand tour" of the Continent and wrote fluent Latin, though his style was more Jesuitical or macaronic than classical. During his residence in foreign countries, he presumably sought the company of kindred spirits and thus acquainted himself with some of the preoccupations and readings of continental scholars. On his return to England, he is reported to have promoted or financed the translation and publication of a treatise by Drexelius, *On Eternity*, with which he probably became acquainted in Holland. Later, when he lost his fortune, ceased to be the patron of Francis Quarles, and retired to Oxford, Benlowes became an assiduous reader in the University libraries, especially in the Bodleian, where Robert Burton, the prototype of seventeenth-century melancholia and its greatest diagnostician, had culled much of his vast and varied learning a few years earlier. Benlowes can indeed be said to have read many of the same books as Burton, for he had little choice; and he transmuted his sources into the same kind of baroque art of writing as Burton, but with a less consistent artistry and less ability to synthesize his readings.

Though the largest libraries of that age rarely contained much more than a thousand volumes, enough for one man to read and assimilate in a few years of constant study, it is difficult to trace, through the welter of Renaissance knowledge and beliefs, clear trends in the thought of many writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Perhaps the clearest distinctions that we can apply are still those of the Catholic Church which, for obvious theological and political reasons, was bound to distinguish carefully when it approved some works as orthodox and condemned others as heretical. The theology and learning of the Catholic poet Richard Crashaw thus revealed, even before his final conversion from Anglicanism to the Roman Church, more Spanish, French, and Italian influences, and more varied Latin influences, than those of Thomas Vaughan, a staunch Anglican. Benlowes, an Anglican who was converted to Catholicism and later reverted to Anglicanism, is more confused and confusing in his beliefs than either Crashaw, who consistently tended towards the Catholicism that he finally adopted, or Vaughan, who never wavered in his faith.[2]

Some general Neoplatonic influences, however, pervade most of the metaphysical poetry of the age. Petrarchan Catholics and Protestants alike generally agreed in rejecting Thomist Aristotelianism in favor of the kind of Neoplatonism, much influenced by Plotinus, that Gemis-

[2] Austin Warren, in *Richard Crashaw, a Study in Baroque Sensibility* (Baton Rouge, La., 1939), has traced the growing importance of the Catholic element in the poetry of Crashaw, who became, however, a Catholic only towards the end of his life, when he had already written most of his poems.

tus Pletho, Marsilio Ficino, and Pico della Mirandola had taught in Italy; only a few Calvinists and other Puritans rejected all the Greco-Roman models of the humanists in favor of purely Biblical sources, and only a few strict disciples of Jesuitical or Counter-Reformation thought remained faithful to Thomist Aristotelianism. A careful analysis of the vocabulary, imagery, and topics of each metaphysical poet is thus our best guide to an understanding of his beliefs.

The mere titles which Benlowes chose for some of his poems are in this respect significant. His chief work is called *Pneumato-sarco-machia, or Theophila's Love-Sacrifice.* In this weirdly learned title, Benlowes was inspired by a Latin poem of the fifth century, the *Psychomachia* of the Christian poet, Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, whose influence, together with that of later Christian Latin poets, can be detected in the Latin versification and vocabulary of Benlowes. Our poet's elegiac couplets are indeed scarcely Ovidian, but illustrate a blend of Renaissance Jesuit or almost macaronic Latin and mediaeval abstraction with paradoxes, antitheses, puns, and other tropes such as Baudelaire, in his one Latin poem, carefully imitated two centuries later, with romantic enthusiasm for the gothic Latin of sacred hymns:

> Vivo Deo, morior Mundo, moriendo resurgo . . .
> Sic amet omnis Amans, sic immoriatur Amanti . . .
> Quid Te, Christe, Crucem perferre coegit? Amoris
> Ardor! Amaroris Pignus Amoris erat.

The same kinds of paradoxes and punning appear in the English poetry of Benlowes:

> Deprav'd by vice, deprived of grace . . .

In the baroque art of poetry, these rhetorical devices are part of the general mediaeval heritage of the Renaissance which neoclassicism later condemned. In English poetry, the vogue for such devices can to a great extent be traced to the success of the Latin epigrams of John Owen, first published in 1624, which Benlowes himself emulated and imitated in his *Sphinx Theologica,* published in 1626 or 1636.

Pneumato-sarco-machia means "the conflict between the soul and the flesh." In choosing *pneuma,* the breath, rather than the less physical and more usual word *psyche,* Benlowes reveals that he believed, with many others before him, that a dying man's soul parts from his body in his last breath. The Cambridge Platonists, Joseph Glanvill and Henry More, contemporaries of Benlowes (who had studied at St. John's College, Cambridge), argued that, just as the individual's breath on leaving the body becomes merged in the surrounding air, the released soul returns to an infinite world-soul from which it had been

divorced in the finite exile of flesh. Benlowes seems to have shared some such Averroist beliefs with other Neoplatonists of his age. Theophila (Lover of God), the name that Benlowes gives to the soul, is of the same general family of allegorical or Petrarchan names as Délie, the lady whom Maurice Scève, the sixteenth-century French Petrarchan poet, invented as an anagram for "L'idée," or as Sophia (Wisdom), one of the two disputants of Leone Ebreo's *Dialoghi d'Amore*—a widely read Neoplatonist philosophical work of the Renaissance, quoted by Montaigne in his *Essays* and by Burton in his *Anatomy*. Such allegorical conceits, inherited in part from the literature of the Middle Ages and especially from such works as the *Roman de la Rose*, were still very popular in seventeenth-century poetry, in spite of the competition of more courtly or humanistic onomastics such as those of the new pastoral vogue which Tasso and Guarini had helped popularize. Allegorical names seem indeed to have been closely allied, in baroque literature, to the vogue for illustrative emblems which Benlowes and his friend Quarles helped to launch in England a century after Maurice Scève and the Petrarchan poets and printers of Lyons had introduced them to France.

Though many other curious influences can be detected in the poetry of Benlowes, their significance in his poetry is generally as blurred or accidental as in much other minor poetry of the metaphysical school; like other learned poets of his age, Benlowes, for all his great display of learning, is not always as truly learned as he pretends to be. The information that he imparts so generously and enthusiastically is rarely original, often of little value or very confused. The complex astronomical calculations of his "Author's Preface," for instance, would lead us to believe that he was well versed in the new science of physics and knew the discoveries of Kepler, Copernicus, and Galileo; but Benlowes seems to be still thinking in terms of mediaeval geocentric astronomy; his calculations reveal, wherever he may have borrowed them, that he viewed the earth, much as Dante did, as the finite center of the universe, enclosed within "coelestial" and "super-coelestial" spheres which are all inhabited by various hierarchies of "aetherial bodies" or "intelligencies altogether spiritual and immortal," until one reaches their ultimate and infinite limit in an "Empyraean heaven"—as in the old and orthodox Ptolemaic system of astronomy which the Catholic Church still defended.

One of the lovely illustrations in the first edition of *Theophila*, the designing of which Benlowes so carefully supervised that his book has survived as a classic of seventeenth-century English printing and bookmaking and has inspired considerable bibliographic research, shows us the Cabbalist Tetragrammaton, the four Hebrew letters which compose

the name IAHVEH; and the text of *Theophila* includes several other Hebrew words as well as various references to Cabbalist doctrine, which suggests that our author may have known some Hebrew. But every Hebrew word that Benlowes uses can be found elsewhere in the English literature of his century, generally in the Authorized Version of the Bible. If one seeks one of these words first in a Hebrew lexicon that quotes classical references, then refers to the Authorized Version's translation of these references, one finds, for instance, that even *Zanzummims,* a rare word used but once in the whole Bible, in Deuteronomy 2: 20, and probably meaning "giants," remains untranslated in the Authorized Version and is there transcribed into English exactly as Benlowes spells it in *Theophila* 3, 17—except that the Authorized Version spells it *Zam-zummins.* But this orthographic change in the Benlowes text may be a printer's error; had Benlowes really been a Hebrew scholar, he would surely have availed himself of this opportunity of displaying his learning, in an age when Orientalism was at a premium, by correcting the repetition of plural suffixes, Hebrew and English, by suppressing either the one in *-im* or the one in *-s.* As for the Tetragrammaton, Benlowes could find it in many non-Hebrew works of Cabbalist lore; it was as familiar a sign to Renaissance scholars of the Protestant north as that of a kosher restaurant to a non-Jewish New Yorker. We may thus safely conclude that Benlowes knew no Hebrew.

Theophila was first published in 1652. In 1647, Henry More had published his *Song of the Soul* and, also in 1652, Joseph Beaumont had first published his *Psyche or Love's Mystery, in XXIX cantos.* Benlowes, who was about fifteen years older than Beaumont, had devoted many years to the writing of *Theophila,* and had long delayed its publication. There is little technical or stylistic affinity between the smooth humanist verse of More or the Marinist elegance of Beaumont's Italianate manner and the tortured rhythms and extravagant tropes of Benlowes. Besides, More was an ardent propagandist for the new science of astronomy, whereas Benlowes was still becalmed in mediaeval science. He derived much of his imagery, as had Donne and other metaphysical poets, from alchemy, which provided the "chemic stones" and "love-chemy" and other such terms which appear throughout *Theophila*:

> In chemic art thou my elixir be;
> Convert to gold the worthless dross in me.

Still, the Neoplatonism of Benlowes was ultimately derived from the same sources as More's. In Holland, where there were numerous Behmenist communities, Benlowes had become acquainted with the mystical

theories of Jacob Boehme, whose works were soon made available in English, as they were translated and published by John Pordage (1607-1681); Benlowes may also have known Knorr von Rosenroth's *Cabbala Denudata* and the works of Agrippa von Nettesheim, who had influenced Thomas Vaughan, the alchemist brother of the Silurist poet of *Silex Scintillans*. And he may have known the credulous little book by the English numerologist, William Ingpen, in which the secrets of Philo Judaeus and of "the Rabbins" were also made public knowledge among the curious thinkers of that intellectually restless age.

In the latter half of the English seventeenth century, the mysticism and chivalrous romance of the Middle Ages, revived from the age of Petrarch to that of Ariosto at the courts of Burgundy and of northern Italy, made a last stand in the writings of a few metaphysical and heroic poets such as Benlowes and Kynaston. However, Horatian neoclassicism, introduced into England by Ben Jonson, was already progressing towards the hegemony that it was to enjoy in the eras of Dryden and of Pope. Some of the minor metaphysical poets, in this transitional age of conflicting standards and tastes, thus share, with American poetry of our age, a peculiar "quiz kid" compulsion to accumulate encylopaedically the oddest tidbits of information without troubling to consider whether all their "facts" can really be fitted together in a coherent and valid system of knowledge. The absolutism of mediaeval thought, in spite of the Counter-Reformation, was already disintegrating fast; some of its inherent contradictions and ineptitudes had become so obvious that many thinkers were already striving towards a new experimental and empirical science, a method whereby the individual would be able to test his knowledge without being forced to submit to authorities. This new science, born among some of the disciples of William of Ockham but elaborated in the sixteenth century, was to achieve its maturity two centuries later, in the generation of Voltaire. In the age of Benlowes, there were still no generally accepted standards or methods whereby the average thinker could test or organize the mass of general knowledge that was available to him—the old mediaeval standards and methods no longer seemed adequate and those of the new science had not yet been formulated.

Today, thinkers and artists face a similar problem, which reveals itself in our generally unscientific interest in sciences, the standards and methods of which are beyond the understanding of the average newspaper reader who accepts his scientific facts on the mere authority of some journalist. Just as we, in our thirst for encyclopaedic knowledge, now tend to accumulate almost as much error as truth and have no real means of individually distinguishing error from truth or hypothesis from fact—so did some of the metaphysical poets and their readers

sometimes accumulate, for all their learning, more knowledge than wisdom, more apparently factual bric-à-brac than truth—much as some modern American poets manage to mingle the mutually exclusive philosophies of Marx, Freud, and Kierkegaard. Of this well-intentioned folly of too much knowledge, Benlowes is perhaps the best example among the metaphysical poets. Yet, though often marred by absurd ideas, halting rhythms, and tortured rhetoric, his poetry sometimes achieves a rare quality of vividly manneristic imagery, which it shares with the greatest and with much minor poetry of its period, such as Thomas Carew's "Spring" or Joshua Sylvester's *Du Bartas his Divine Weeks and Works*—a quality that the Sitwells have consciously exploited again in our age:

> Arise; and rising, emulate the rare
> Industrious spinsters, who with fair
> Embroid'ries checker-work the chambers of the air . . .
> Gloomier than west of death; than north of night . . .
> Betimes, when keen-breath'd winds, with frosty cream
> Periwig bald trees, glaze tattling stream . . .
> . . . . . when quivering winter's dress
> Is icicled with hoary trees . . .

Tortured beyond recognition, like the martyred saints whom he sees "racked into an anagram," the verse of Benlowes sometimes loses all sense of poetry, but recovers it in those flashes where his vision seems at last to transcend all his elaborate thought and rhetoric. Few gifted poets, in any age, have been so consistently and willfully antipoetic as Benlowes could be when, for instance, he expanded in too literal manner, to the point of absurdity, the metaphors and conceits that were commonplaces among the poets of his era:

> Victorious flames glow from thy brighter eye;
> Cloud those twin-lightning orbs (They'll fry
> An ice-veined monk), cloud them, or planet-struck, I die.

But even such verses are no worse than those of Crashaw in "The Weeper," where Mary Magdalene's tears are described as "walking baths" and "portable, and compendious oceans."

In choosing so lofty a theme for *Theophila*, and in planning so vast a poem—each canto, and there are thirteen of them, is composed of some hundred stanzas—Benlowes was attempting more than he could actually achieve in poetic tone or structure. Though each canto is intended to discuss a different episode of the love-sacrifice, the Praelibation, Humiliation, Restoration, Inamoration, and others until we reach the Reinvitation and the Termination, the poet's habits of digression were such that no reader can unravel the tangle of the whole poem's structure or detect much order or harmony in its various parts. Latin trans-

lations of earlier English cantos are inserted at random; Latin versions of Cantos I and II thus appear suddenly between Canto IX, which appears in both Latin and English, and Canto X, which is in English. Shorter poems and prose pieces, in Latin or in English, are scattered here and there throughout the book, between various parts of the whole poem, some of them by the author, others by his friends. The tone of the poetry varies constantly and often most abruptly, from the gorgeous to the grotesque, the lofty to the macaronic, the devotional to the satirical, as the poet follows his fantastic inspiration without ever, it seems, allowing any self-criticism to deter him:

> In twice-dyed Tyrian purple thou dost nest,
> Restless, with heaving fumes oppress,
> Which cause tumultuous dreams, foes to indulgent rest.
>
> From hence the spark (what pity 'tis!) is ill,
> Grown crop-sick. Post for physic's skill;
> Phlebotomize he must, and take the vomit pill.
>
> Doctor, the cause of this distemper state us.
> "His cachexy results from flatus,
> Hypocondrunkicus ex crapula creatus!"

In his satirical verse, Benlowes had the sarcastic verbal exuberance of Samuel Butler, and might have successfully composed some poetical *Rake's Progress,* with much of the rhyming wit of *Hudibras,* had he been capable of following a plan or plot and denying himself for a while the pleasure of more solemnly lofty writing. As a distiller of elaborate conceits, Benlowes might likewise have emulated successfully some of his more famous colleagues of the baroque school of English poetry, had he been capable of excluding from a loftier poem some of his more satiric or macaronic fantasies.

The poetics of his time allowed, indeed, greater liberties than those of almost any other age. From the early sixteenth century, when Ariosto, in *Orlando Furioso,* permitted himself every rhetorical eccentricity listed in the classical textbooks, including examples of zeugma and tmesis which in almost any other era might have appeared ludicrous, until the early eighteenth century when the American poet, Edward Taylor, was able to offer us one of the very rare examples of tmesis in English poetry, baroque poets knew fewer constraints of form or taste than any poets except those of our own age:

> We'l Nightingaile sing like,
> When pearcht on high
> In Glories Cage, thy glory, bright:
> Yea, thankfully,
> For joy.

Such occasional eccentricities of rhetoric or syntax as in this poem of Edward Taylor do not necessarily detract from the unity or beauty of the whole poem. But Benlowes fails too often, as a poet, because of his inability to judge his own work and to select, to order, to exclude the inept or the inappropriate. His aesthetics is that of potluck, with haphazard extra tidbits thrown in for full measure, as if he were always afraid of seeming poor, artless, or inarticulate. There is thus a bit of everything in his garrulous poem, from calligrams to prayers—except order, moderation, organization, unity of structure and of tone. Were it not for *Theophila's* clearly contrived quality, for the evidence of ingenuity and of effort in every line, for the never-waning emphasis of the poet's tone, one might be tempted to discuss his work in terms of surrealist aesthetics and to speak of the "automatic" quality of his writing. But it takes more than an inspired fantasy or a fruitful subconscious to produce, whether in Latin or in English, a *versus cancrinus* which reads backwards exactly as it reads forwards:

Te nam (an iurares) sera Ruina manet.

It requires likewise more than a ready wit to think of Adam as "Chanc'llor installed of Eden's University," or to exclaim:

Cancel the lease of my clay-tenement
Which pays dear rent of groans...

Though already neoclassical in his theories of imitation, the baroque artist was also, in his imagery and style, often as inventive and "accustomed to plain hallucination" as Rimbaud or any other verbal alchemist of extreme romanticism or of surrealism. The age of Weierus and of Burton, whose understanding of the psychology of the insane and the melancholic remained unsurpassed for over a hundred years, produced an art which sought, by the complexity of its devices and the inventiveness of its fantasies, to emulate the apparently irrational and willful exuberance of nature. From the fictional madness of Ariosto's Roland, of Kyd's Hieronimo, of Ophelia and King Lear, or from Giordano Bruno's *Gli Eroici Furori*, to the actual madness of the poet Tasso, art had acquired many devices of illusion and hallucination which, however formalized or artificial, yet sought to transmute the reality of its subject matter into something both more and less real.

As an architect, the baroque artist thus transformed his architectonic elements into imitations of natural phenomena, his columns into twisted and vine-entangled tree trunks, his altars into the marble cloud banks of a Berninesque Assumption into Heaven, or else into imitations of other architectonic elements—his empty walls, by means of false perspectives, into spacious colonnaded galleries, his framed panels, by setting paintings

there, into windows opened onto another world. As a composer, he imitated on the violin, as Johann Sebastian Bach did in several concertos, the vocal effects of the lyrical or recitative passages of earlier opera or the madrigal; or else, like Orlando di Lasso in his "Echo," he imitated, in contrapuntal *trompe-l'œil*, the oddities of nature. As a painter, the baroque artist invented, as did Arcimboldo, allegorical creatures whose bodies were built of flowers or fruits or books or geometrical instruments; or he brought, as did Caravaggio or Spranger, so much movement into his compositions that the foreshortened limbs of his violent figures seem to reach out of the canvas; or he set calm statues among his struggling figures to make the latter seem more lifelike, or he set paintings, as did Vermeer, on the walls of his painted interiors so that these seemed more real. As a dramatist, he invented the play within the play as in *Hamlet*, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, or in *The Roman Actor*, so that the players of his primary plot, as they watched the secondary play, seemed more real because they then became assimilated for a while to their audience. As a lyrical poet, he sought in each verse to achieve, by elaborate tropes and conceits, some magic whereby his diction of everyday speech might be transmuted into something more lofty; or he had his poems printed in calligrams, in the form of an altar or a heart—much as the cabinetmakers of his age also transformed a merely useful desk, for instance, with all its necessary bureau drawers, into a fantastic miniature temple or palace, with carved columns and niches and altars, and perspectives of intaglio, which all serve a double purpose. Though not yet able to conceive of the unrestrained fantasy of Rimbaud who saw "a drawing room at the bottom of a lake," the baroque artist strove, by using such surprising devices, towards the same kind of "paranoid" ambiguity, as Salvador Dali has called it. Nonetheless, baroque art remained faithful, in general, to classical concepts in the general structure which constrained the free association of its ornamental details.

Benlowes, in most of his poetry, failed to find this necessary equilibrium of form and ornament. His inventiveness was often too forced or manneristic to allow him the truly free association which, in the poetry of Rimbaud, can dispense with classical form; and his peculiar provincialism shielded him, it seems, from the kind of critical competition which, in Italian courts and academies, had already helped so much to refine art and taste by reaffirming the concepts of reason—whereby the baroque was slowly transformed into the neoclassical style. Instead of associating freely according to the patterns of his nature rather than those of artistic reminiscence, or of following more strictly the patterns of art, Benlowes mixed, too freely for art as imitation but not freely enough for art as invention or as nature, the various manners and tones

of art, the gorgeous and the grotesque, the lofty and the macaronic, the liturgical and the satirical. His poems therefore lack unity of tone as much as of structure, imitating the accidental confusion of the ideas that he acquired in what Donne once called a "hydroptic immoderate desire of human learning"—rather than any substantial confusion of his emotions. The disorder of such an art reflects no disorder of nature; and the confused poet and thinker of *The Summary of Wisdom,* one of the shorter works of Benlowes, left us, for all his great talent, often but a summary of folly, wise neither as artist nor as thinker, neither in the realm of the beautiful nor in that of the true.

Los Angeles

CHINA IN THE *ESPRIT DES LOIS*: MONTESQUIEU AND MGR. FOUCQUET

ARNOLD H. ROWBOTHAM

IN HIS article, "La Chine dans l'*Esprit des Lois*," Carcassonne says: "Nous n'avons pas pu préciser l'époque où Montesquieu a commencé à s'occuper de la Chine."[1] While this statement, in a general way, may still be correct, it does not take into account certain evidence in the life and works of the author which may serve, at least, to clarify the problem. The purpose of this article is to show that Montesquieu's relations with Père Jean-François Foucquet must have exerted a considerable influence on his theories concerning China, and that his contacts with the ex-Jesuit missionary may throw some light on certain obscurities involved in the problem, which have been pointed out by Carcassonne.

Miss Dodds, in her book, *Les Récits de voyage, sources de "l'Esprit des Lois,"* repeats the theory of Carcassonne that Montesquieu's knowledge of the Orient came from two sources: (1) certain works which he had at hand at the time of writing (the titles of which he generally cites), and (2) facts and ideas which he had previously absorbed and digested to such an extent that they had become a part of his thought pattern.[2] To these two sources should be added a third, namely, evidence conveyed orally to him by men who were masters of the subject. The information provided by Foucquet falls in this category.

Montesquieu became acquainted with the former China missionary during his visit to Rome in 1729. The author of the *Esprit des Lois* was in Rome from January 19 to the end of April of that year and again from May 7 to July 4. It is significant that this was about the time—according to his own testimony—that he was beginning to plan his great work on government.[3] In Rome he made the acquaintance of a number

[1] E. Carcassonne, "La Chine dans l'*Esprit des Lois*," RHL, XXXI (1924), 204, note.

[2] Muriel Dodds, *Les Récits de voyage, sources de "l'Esprit des Lois" de Montesquieu* (Paris, 1929), pp. 29-30.

[3] Montesquieu himself says: "Dans le cours de vingt années j'ai vu mon ouvrage commencer, croître, s'avancer et finir" (*Œuvres*, ed. Laboulaye, III, 85); and, in March 1749, he wrote to the Maltese ambassador to Rome, M. Solar: "... il y a vingt ans que je découvris mes principes" (*Ibid.*, Introd. à l'*Esprit des Lois*, p. 11).

of prominent men, among them the Cardinal de Polignac, Abbé Nicolini, Father Ceruti, and Jean-François Foucquet. In his notes on his travels he gives a list of these men, putting them in what he considers the order of importance, from his point of view. Foucquet's name appears at the bottom of the list.[4] Direct relations between the two men seem to have been limited to their conversations in Rome. In December 1729 we find Montesquieu writing to Father Ceruti regarding the transfer of a benefice in Brittany from Foucquet to his own secretary, Abbé Duval (in which transaction Ceruti seems to have acted as go-between),[5] but there is no evidence that he kept up a correspondence with Foucquet, as was the case with several other men whose names are on the list.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the conversations between the two men were extremely important and that they made a deep impression on the mind of the visitor. A fortnight after his arrival in Rome we find Montesquieu writing: "J'ai eu ce Ier février une très grande conversation avec Mgr Fouquet."[6] If this was the first of his talks with the ex-missionary, it was evidently by no means the last. Foucquet was a great talker and Montesquieu, by his own confession, had a receptive ear.

Jean-François Foucquet had been in China from 1699 to 1721.[7] He had become a profound student of Chinese thought and culture and, like most of his colleagues, he had returned to Europe with a deep conviction of the richness and worth of Chinese civilization. He belonged to that little group of China missionaries known as the Figurists—a group whose influence was considerable though its number was small. The Figurists had developed interesting, though somewhat fantastic, theories regarding the identity of the ancient religion of China with early Judaism. With these theories they were able to support the position of their other Jesuit colleagues that there was no essential antagonism between the religion of the scholars and Christian doctrine. Foucquet agreed with their theories as to origins but disagreed entirely with their conclusions. He looked upon the history of Chinese religion as a history of spiritual decadence from a pure monotheism to a frank atheism. Since this point of view was contrary to the position taken by the Society as a whole, and since it gave encouragement to those anti-Jesuits whose opposition was threatening the success of the China mission,

[4] *Voyages*, ed. du Baron de Montesquieu (Bordeaux, 1894-96), II, 66.

[5] *Correspondance*, ed. Gébelin (Paris, 1914), I, 278.

[6] *Un Carnet inédit, le Spicilège*, introd. et notes par André Masson (Paris, 1944), p. 146.

[7] For an account of life of Foucquet see Louis Pfister, *Notices biog. et bibliog. sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne mission de Chine*, Variétés sinologiques, No. 59 (Shanghai, 1932), I, 549-554.

Foucquet was rebuked for his view and finally forced out of the Society. As a reward for his long services and his undoubted zeal, however, he was invested with the titular bishopric of Eleutheropolis; since 1723, he had been living in the house of the Propaganda in Rome, spending his time in writing about, and in disseminating orally, his views concerning Chinese chronology and religion. He died in 1739 or 1740.

In the matter of Chinese chronology—a subject which was engaging the earnest attention of European scholars at the moment—he also held views contrary to those of the majority of his colleagues. While his fellow Jesuits were placing the beginnings of Chinese civilization somewhere over two thousand years before Christ (for example, Bouvet, another Figurist, thought that Chinese history could definitely be traced back to the period of Yao, 2357-2255 B.C.), Foucquet refused to accept as authentic anything which preceded the fifth century B.C. He expounded his views in a work entitled *Tabula chronologica historiae . . .*, published in 1729, the year of Montesquieu's visit to Rome. In a letter to the Cardinal de Polignac, written at the end of the same year, Montesquieu refers to this work when he tells of displaying his newly acquired knowledge of China to a badly informed professor at Bologna. I told him—he says—("moi qui sortais des mains de Mgr. Foucquet") that only two months ago it was established that the Chinese monarchy reached only as far back as four hundred B.C. One detects a touch of malice in this statement and the accompanying comment: "il fut étonné d'un changement si subit, et toute la compagnie aussi."[8]

For years Foucquet had been disseminating his views regarding China with persistence and vivacity. This vivacity seems to have changed to acrimony after he had been forced out of the Society. Apparently his theories regarding early Chinese history and religion became a sort of *idée fixe* and he discussed them at length with everyone who would listen. It is noteworthy that his circle of acquaintances included some of the best known men of the time, among them Saint-Simon, Alexander Ramsay, Lafitau (whose important *Mœurs des sauvages Américains . . .* bears the imprint of his views), and, apparently, Voltaire.[9]

Valuable evidence as to what the conversations between Montesquieu and Foucquet may have been like is provided by the Italian let-

[8] *Corr.*, I, 270.

[9] At any rate Voltaire (*Œuvres*, Moland ed., XXX, 430-431), upholding his views that the Chinese were not atheists, says: "Il [Foucquet] *m'a dit plusieurs fois* qu'il y avait à la Chine très peu de philosophes athées." I have discovered no evidence as to when Voltaire met Foucquet. It was probably before his visit to England, since Foucquet was in Paris about 1722, for a short time.

ters of President de Brosses,[10] who visited Rome a decade later than the author of the *Esprit des Lois*. De Brosses gives the following description of the ex-missionary: "C'est un vieillard de soixante-quinze ans, plein de vivacité, d'une figure agréable; décorée d'une majestueuse barbe blanche jusqu'à la ceinture, que le fait ressembler aux portraits de feu Platon." He found the priest garrulous but highly interesting and enlightening. The two met about a dozen times and in these interviews of one or two hours De Brosses learned a great deal, although—as he says—the conversations frequently took the form of monologues. De Brosses reports that Foucquet respected his Jesuit ex-colleagues but had no love for them. The ex-Jesuit seems to have won over his French visitor to his point of view on those controversial matters on which the bishop differed from the members of the Society.

On the evidence of De Brosses, one may conclude that Montesquieu found in Foucquet a talkative old man who, though an expert in his subject, was affected by bitterness engendered by his failure to get his point of view widely accepted. It is clear that Montesquieu was impressed. He may have taken notes of these conversations, for in one of his written comments on Chinese religion he adds: "Voyez ce que j'ai recueilli de M. Foucquet."[11] Furthermore, he includes the name of Foucquet among those in Rome whose acquaintance was worthwhile.

The comments of De Brosses may also furnish a possible solution to the source of Montesquieu's remark: "C'est le bâton qui gouverne la Chine."[12] The author of the *Esprit des Lois,* who is generally meticulous in his references, attributes this statement to Duhalde; but the assertion is not found in his work and critics have been forced to conclude that it came from another source. In a letter addressed to M. de Neuilly, describing his relations with Foucquet, De Brosses says: "Je ne puis prendre confiance en un peuple qui n'est dressé que comme les chiens couchants *à coup de bâton*";[13] he follows this remark with a story, told him by Foucquet, in which the emperor orders the beating of an official who had not appeared at an audience called by the monarch. Here, then, is the idea that China is governed by the rod, clearly expressed. The garrulous old priest must have repeated himself many times in his talks with visitors. One might, then, hazard the guess that

[10] Charles de Brosses, *Lettres familières écrites d'Italie en 1739 et en 1740* (Paris, n. d.), Letter xlvi, II, 229 ff.

[11] *Pensées et Fragments*, ed. du Baron de Montesquieu (Bordeaux, 1901), II, 216, note. The *Spicilège* of Montesquieu has a number of references to China, particularly to the Rites Controversy.

[12] Montesquieu (*Esprit des Lois*, VIII, xxi) says: "J'ignore ce que c'est que cet honneur dont on parle chez des peuples à qui on ne fait rien *qu'à coups de bâton*"; to which he appends the note: "C'est le bâton qui gouverne la Chine, dit le P. du Halde, Disc. de la Chine t. II, p. 134."

[13] De Brosses, *op. cit.*, II, 246.

the remark, "C'est le bâton qui gouverne la Chine," had its source not in Duhalde but in Montesquieu's talks with Foucquet.

Whether this assumption is correct or not, it is evident that Montesquieu's ideas regarding China were influenced by sources other than the works which he himself cites.[14] To what extent can it be claimed that he was influenced by the ex-Jesuit Foucquet?

In his discussion of Montesquieu's Chinese sources Carcassonne arrives at the following conclusion: Reasoning *a priori*, Montesquieu uses the current tradition of kingship and his knowledge of the governments of the Near East to arrive at the theory that China followed the pattern of all despotisms, whose systems were based on fear. Then, searching for evidence to support this conclusion, he finds himself confronted with the Sinophile panegyrics of the Jesuits (particularly Duhalde), which force him to modify, if not to abandon, his original position.

In view of the evidence presented here the conclusion of Carcassonne might be modified as follows: Montesquieu started with a preconceived theory of despotism, coming from his intellectual environment and the literature on the Near East. Then came his talks with Foucquet, which confirmed many of his ideas regarding Oriental despotism but, at the same time, impressed him with the richness and significance of Chinese thought and institutions. These conversations probably placed him in a neutral position, although he still adhered to his arbitrary classification. Then, in 1735, Duhalde published his extraordinary work, containing the essence of the Jesuit eulogy of China, well documented. Here was evidence which Montesquieu could not overlook, in spite of the fact that it came from those Jesuits with whom Foucquet had quarreled. As can be seen from his frequent quotations, Montesquieu (like Voltaire) leaned heavily on the work.[15] It did not prevent him, how-

[14] An interesting parallel to the Foucquet-Montesquieu relationship is to be found in that of Father Grimaldi and Leibnitz, the greatest of the seventeenth-eighteenth-century Sinophiles. Leibnitz, on a visit to Rome in 1689, met Grimaldi, the head of the Peking Jesuit mission and from him (chiefly) acquired his intense interest in China.

[15] The chief sources of Montesquieu's book knowledge of China are: (1) *A Voyage Around the World*... by George Anson, compiled by Richard Walter (London, 1748); (2) *Journal de la résidence du sieur Lange*... *à la Cour de la Chine* (Leyde, 1726); (3) the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*... (published periodically throughout the eighteenth century); and (4) Duhalde, *Description*... *de la Chine* (Paris, 1735). The few pages on China in Anson's work are devoted chiefly to the duplicity of Chinese merchants and officials at Canton; Lange's longer account is mainly a summary of the tortuosities of Chinese diplomacy in the capital; the *Lettres édifiantes*, a much more important source, is mentioned five times in the *Esprit des Lois*; Duhalde's work is mentioned a score of times. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Voltaire chides Montesquieu for not leaning more heavily on the undoubted authority of Duhalde (Voltaire, *Œuvres*, Moland ed., XXX, 430-431).

ever, from retaining much of the scepticism regarding Chinese political institutions which Foucquet had communicated to him. If there is any confusion, therefore, in the mind of Montesquieu regarding Chinese civilization, it is a confusion resulting from a conflict between the evidence published by Duhalde and the verbal testimony given to the author, during his visit to Rome, by Foucquet.

University of California, Berkeley

THE PROVERB: RABELAIS AND CERVANTES

ELEANOR O'KANE

IN THE course of his detailed study of the language of Rabelais, L. Sainéan makes certain observations concerning the use of popular forms which have been for me a stimulating and fruitful source of reflection. Commenting on the wealth of folk sayings scattered throughout Rabelais' work, Sainéan states his opinion that Rabelais was the greatest artist of all time in the use of proverbs. Cervantes, the only possible competitor, is dismissed because "les proverbes allégués par Sancho Pança coulent comme une eau calme qui se confond avec celle de la sagesse populaire elle-même, alors que les dictons de Rabelais sont puisés à des sources hétérogènes et présentent des aspects les plus variés."[1] The critic goes on to speak of the eleventh chapter of *Gargantua* and the twenty-second of the *Cinquième livre*, ingenious accumulations of popular and learned wisdom, as unique *curiosa* in the realm of paroemiology.[2] He remarks further that Rabelais was almost the last sixteenth-century writer of importance to use proverbs; the French Renaissance brought a reaction against the popular element in general, and by the seventeenth century proverbs had disappeared from French literature.[3]

Any student of Cervantes must be surprised at Sainéan's summary dismissal of a writer whose debt to the language of the people can never be sufficiently emphasized. And it would seem that Sainéan himself, in the sentence just quoted, furnishes the key to a different type of evaluation, which will show us the real meaning of the proverb for each of these men of the Renaissance. When the critic speaks of Sancho's proverbs as flowing like tranquil waters which are inseparable from the general current of folk wisdom, he would seem to concede to Cervantes a certain ease and flexibility which may be considered the mark of the superior paroemiological artist. The problem of this mastery appears to be related, furthermore, to two other points raised by Sainéan —namely, the unique quality of the proverbial *tours de force* of Rabelais and the antipopular character of the French Renaissance. An analysis of the stylistic use of proverbs by the two authors will, I believe, make

[1] L. Sainéan, *La Langue de Rabelais* (Paris, 1905), p. 447.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 356.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

clear the outstanding achievement of Cervantes. And a few examples of the literary proverbs of mediaeval Spain will show that this skill is attributable, in great part, to the literary heredity and environment of the author.

In Spain, the popular proverb is not in conflict with the Renaissance; on the contrary, the Renaissance reinforces and redirects the vigorous paroemiological tradition already in existence. Américo Castro, in studying the thought of Cervantes, makes this quite clear:

> De esta suerte se llega a la dignificación de lo popular en una época que desprecia soberanamente al vulgo, como incapaz de juicio y razonar propio. El Renacimiento rinde culto a lo popular, como objeto de reflexión, pero lo desdeña como sujeto operante. *De todos modos, en España, por el sesgo especial de nuestra historia el humanismo pone fuerte acento en esta rehabilitación del espíritu vulgar . . .* [italics mine].[4]

The last sentence makes immediately clear a difference in shading between the French Renaissance and the Spanish. The great representative of each faithfully reflects the environment in which he lived and worked. Rabelais, like his master Erasmus (who in turn was following such classical writers as Quintilian), considers the proverb a "little gem" to be scattered judiciously throughout the text as an adornment of style. Cervantes, on the other hand, esteems the proverb for its own sake. His attitude may well be summed up in the words of a closer contemporary of Rabelais, Juan de Valdés: "Lo mejor que los refranes tienen es ser nacidos en el vulgo . . . El castellano más puro que tenemos se halla en los refranes."[5] This critical tribute to the intrinsic worth of the proverb is something new, a product of the Renaissance. But the attitude it reflects goes far back into Spanish literature.

An important difference in attitude toward the things of the people elsewhere in Renaissance Europe is illustrated by a contemporary painting, the *Flemish Proverbs* of Peter Breughel the Elder, painted in 1559. A generation ago, Wilhelm Fraenger pointed out the close affinity between this work and the famous chapters in proverbs of Rabelais.[6] In both works, he said, we see purely mechanical, depersonalized human figures performing stereotyped actions, most often in impersonal groups, against a background of *Nirgendwo* landscape—the Never, Never Land. This position of Fraenger has recently been reinforced by Professor Otto Benesch, who adds the important observation that Breughel's affinity with the mediaeval folk tradition is purely illusory; Breughel deliberately descended to the peasant, and harked back

[4] A. Castro, *El pensamiento de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1925), pp. 193-194.

[5] J. de Valdés, *Diálogo de la lengua*, ed. J. Moreno Villa (Madrid, 1926), pp. 44, 261.

[6] W. Fraenger, *Der Bauern-Bruegel und das deutsche Sprichwort* (Erlenbach Zürich, 1923).

to the Middle Ages, not to emphasize and affirm the continuity of a national mediaeval folk tradition, but rather to isolate that common factor so dear to the Renaissance thinker—the Common Man. Hence, the figures with the "disk-like" faces are meaningless as real men, important only as the abstract representation of Man. As such, they very properly betray no human feelings or psychological characteristics.[7] All of these observations apply equally to the "animated" proverbs of Rabelais; the mechanized Pantagrueline figures who fall between two stools, whitewash Ethiopians, beat about the bush, and perform other similarly worthy tasks—all, as Fraenger noted, symbolic of human folly—are no more intended to represent real human beings than are the angular, expressionless figures who act out the Flemish proverbs. They are the Common Man—as these two artists see him, an essentially ludicrous type. The comic quality of their mechanization is analyzed by Henri Bergson in his study of the nature of humor:

> *Les attitudes, gestes et mouvements du corps humain sont risibles dans l'exacte mesure où ce corps nous fait penser à un simple mécanique* . . . Le dessin est généralement comique en proportion de la netteté, et aussi de la discrétion avec lesquelles il nous fait voir dans l'homme un pantin articulé. Il faut que cette suggestion soit nette, et que nous apercevions clairement, comme par transparence, un mécanisme démontable à l'intérieur de la personne. Mais il faut aussi que la suggestion soit discrète, et que l'ensemble de la personne où chaque membre a été raidi en piece mécanique, continue à nous donner l'impression d'un être qui vit. L'effet comique est d'autant plus saisissant, l'art du dessinateur est d'autant plus consommé, que ces deux images, celle d'une personne et celle d'une mécanique, sont plus exactement insérées l'une dans l'autre. Et l'originalité d'un dessinateur comique pourrait se définir par le genre particulier de vie qu'il communique à un simple pantin.[8]

It is just this "special kind of life" that is enjoyed by the peasants of Rabelais and Breughel.

In striking contrast to these figures is Sancho Panza, Cervantes' chief exponent of the meaning of proverbs. No one would suggest that Sancho is not a real person, and anyone familiar with Spanish literature will recognize that he is not essentially different from the shepherds of Encina, the mountain girls of the Arcipreste de Hita, and the homely squire of the fourteenth-century Caballero Cifar, to name only a few mediaeval Spanish rustic types. To recall the words of Castro, the Renaissance Spaniard, unlike Erasmus and his disciples, accepts the Common Man not only as an abstract concept but also as a living human being, a *sujeto operante*. Furthermore, whereas in Breughel and Rabelais the proverbs used are deliberately chosen for their appropriateness

[7] O. Benesch, *The Art of the Renaissance in Northern Europe: Its Relation to the Contemporary Spiritual and Intellectual Movements* (Cambridge, 1945), pp. 90-106.

[8] *Le Rire* (Paris, 1925), pp. 30-31.

to symbolize human folly, in Cervantes they are the means by which the noble madman is brought to see that his salvation lies in his kinship with real men. Don Quixote admires not only the homely wisdom of Sancho but also the natural elegance of the proverbs in which he expresses it: "Dime, ¿dónde los hallas, ignorante, o cómo los aplicas, mentecato, que para decir yo uno y aplicarle bien, sudo y trabajo como si cavase?" (II, 43). The importance of that "y aplicarle bien" should not be overlooked.

Perhaps Sancho's secret may be discovered. A consideration of the different devices used by two distinguished Renaissance authors to introduce proverbs into their texts will, it seems to me, show quite clearly how, using the same mediaeval folk material, they achieved diametrically opposed effects, in keeping with their contrasting attitudes toward their material. In order to clarify these attitudes, we cannot do better than recall briefly their common mediaeval heritage.

In the Middle Ages, in all countries, the proverb was esteemed as the synthetic expression of the wisdom accumulated by man over the ages. In a period in which tradition was the determining factor in every action, the proverb was a tremendous didactic force. In every kind of literature, learned as well as popular, the proverb was used to point the moral the writer wished to emphasize. From the beginning, the "vulgar" and "rural" proverb shared the honors with the *sententiae* of antiquity. There was no difference in the way in which the two were used; both were introduced by the formula: "As the proverb says . . . " or "For it is said . . . " In short, this is the attitude of one of the oldest of Arabic proverbs: "There is something wise in every proverb."

In the common art of pointing up his text with proverbs, the mediaeval writer was, of course, more or less felicitous in proportion to his literary skill. An Arcipreste de Hita or a Chaucer carried the art to a high point of development, choosing his proverbs with exquisite precision and frequently using them with ironical or humorous intent for the development of character or plot. This usage, which prevailed throughout the Middle Ages, carefully preserved the formal integrity of the proverb. For the mediaeval writer, the proverb was a unit of language, in almost the same sense in which the word was a unit, and he chose his proverbs as he chose his words to make himself clear, convincing, and agreeable.

Meanwhile, however, there had developed another phenomenon which, while not peculiarly Spanish, is yet so representative of Spain that it deserves careful consideration. We may call this phenomenon the "stylized" proverb. With a critical insight surprising for their time, certain early Spanish writers penetrated the hard shell of tradition

surrounding the proverb and illuminated its content. Their understanding of its true nature restored to the *refrán* the freshness inherent in its colloquial form. For them, the proverb was no longer a unit of language; it was already, before the Renaissance, an *evangelio chico* with a complex nature of its own, to be studied, taken apart, turned inside out, and given new meanings by sudden and unexpected juxtaposition with its fellows. And, like the Gospels, it was assumed to be so familiar that it might be alluded to in passing, with the assurance that the allusion would be understood.

It is probable that in other countries proverbs were used in this way in the conversation of simple people. However, not even Chaucer, a master in the portrayal of human types, captured the art of transferring that kind of conversation to his page. Mrs. Heseltine writes in her introduction to the *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs* that it was not until shortly after the opening of the sixteenth century that ". . . the people became proverb conscious . . . and the folk . . . were speaking, almost thinking, along canalized lines of proverbs." In Spain, on the other hand, mediaeval literature indicates that the *refranes* were so used by all kinds of people, and on every occasion.[9] This assumption seems to furnish the only explanation of the subtlety introduced into still-primitive texts by a knowing use of proverbs.

The artifices by which a proverb may be used as a literary device are of two kinds—purely external tricks and psychological exploitation of the inner content of the proverb. The tricks may be classified, in ascending order of importance, as: accumulation, adaptation, allusion, adaptation-allusion, crossing, twisting, and word play. The more subtle psychological exploitation, which often makes use of some of the external devices, may provoke lively and progressive dialogue, develop the thought of a single person (although it may not seem so, this is more subtle than dialogue), or even carry forward the development of the plot. As we shall see, this latter more subtle usage is almost entirely lacking in Rabelais.

The *accumulation* of proverbs is the most spontaneous manifestation of skill. It probably occurred in the mediaeval literature of all countries, and became a characteristic of the Renaissance in some countries, particularly England. Besides the famous chapters already mentioned, Rabelais has many single examples of accumulation. In the series of *Celestinas*, and in other Renaissance works, Spain also had its share of the tiresome abuse of proverb mongering. But it is worth noting here that, even in mediaeval Spanish, the heaping up of proverbs was gen-

[9] The extent of their use is discussed in the introduction to my forthcoming *Dictionary of Medieval Spanish Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases.*

erally more than a feat of ingenuity. The proverbs are usually accumulated by real persons, and the string of *refranes* often serves to express the development of a thought or to carry forward the movement of the plot, and is not, as in Rabelais, the impersonal thing the Germans call a *Priamel*, a litany of proverbs loosely held together by a common response.

The second step in this attempt to make the proverb an integral part of the text may be called *adaptation*—that is, the indirect quoting of a proverb in such a way that it applies to the person or situation in question at the moment. In Rabelais, about half the proverbs are quoted by adaptation. A third of these are proverbial phrases, which must almost necessarily be used in this way. The best examples, of course, are the two chapters we have mentioned. In sheer cleverness of this kind, in my opinion, Rabelais is surpassed by his Spanish contemporary, Blasco de Garay, whose *Cartas en refranes* (1541) develop whole letters by an ingenious stringing together of great numbers of proverbs. A still more ambitious effort in this style is the anonymous *Entremés de los refranes* sometimes attributed to Cervantes.

The next device, *allusion*, which evokes a proverb by quoting it incompletely or by alluding to one or more of the words which make it up, supposes on the part of the reader a knowledge of the complete form. There are in Spain (and perhaps in France also) many mediaeval examples of this device. Surely none could be more impressive than one taken from a contemporary history of the reign of the Catholic Sovereigns. Ferdinand had sent an ambassador to his father, Juan II of Aragon, to learn the king's opinion of an offer by one of his nobles of political support in exchange for military aid. The king replied that "his son should leave for Andalusia without delay, remembering that homely old adage that they use, 'When he gives you the little goat, etc.' " Here, the fortunes of a kingdom turn on an allusion to the picturesque "Cuando te den la cabrilla, acorre con la soguilla."[10]

A combination of *adaptation* and *allusion* is often very effective. Rabelais quotes some proverbs, perhaps the best samples of his skill, by this double device. Spanish texts are full of examples. At one point a proverb is so deeply embedded in the text of the *Celestina* that it quite escaped the contemporary translator, James Mabbe. Calisto's man Tristan is making bitter reflections on the way of masters with faithful servants: "Dejaos morir sirviendo a ruines, haced locuras en confianza de su defension! Biviendo con el conde que no matasse al hombre, me dava mi madre por consejo" (sc. XIV). The complete proverb is:

[10] Diego de Valera, *Memorial de diversas hazañas*, ed. J. de Matas Carriazo (Madrid, 1941), p. 287.

"Cuando vives con el conde, no mates el hombre, pues morira el conde y te pediran el hombre."[11]

All the devices we have mentioned so far, with the exception of a few combinations, were within the reach of the mediaeval writer. They were ably used by Rabelais, of whom we may say, as Professor Benesch has said of Brueghel, that he is a cunning imitator of the mediaeval artists. But, when we reach the Renaissance stage of proverbial development, we really leave Rabelais and his countrymen behind, although it is precisely at this point that, in England, some of the immediate predecessors of Shakespeare began to show the "proverb consciousness" noted by Mrs. Heseltine.[12]

Two manifestations of this new stage which require considerable skill are the *crossing* of two or more proverbs and the *twisting* of one part of a single proverb, generally by substituting one word for another. Although the point of these tricks may be pure fun, they are more likely, especially in the case of twisting, to have a psychological relationship to the text (person or situation).[13] I have found no examples of crossing in Rabelais. His various twistings are mere horseplay, devoid of psychological content.[14]

In the final proof of dexterity in handling proverbs, *word play* turning on some word in a proverb, Rabelais is also lacking. The *Quijote*,

[11] Sebastian de Horozco, *Recopilacion*, Bibl. Nacional, Madrid, MS No. 1849, fol. 153vo.

[12] A few examples will give some idea of Shakespeare's own successful touch with proverbs:

"PETRUCHIO: Am I not wise?

"KATHARINA: Yes; keep you warm." *Taming of the Shrew*, II, i. (If you are wise, keep yourself warm.)

"STEPHANO: Here is that which will give language to you, cat; open your mouth." *Tempest*, II, ii. (Good liquor will make a cat speak.)

"CELIA: You have misused our sex in your love-prate; we must have your doublet and hose plucked over your head, and show the world what the bird hath done to her own nest." *As You Like It*, IV, i. (It's an ill bird that fouls its own nest.)

Another Englishman who shows comparable skill is Ben Jonson. My knowledge of German writers of the period is not sufficiently extensive for me to be able to judge whether the phenomenon also characterizes the Renaissance in their country.

[13] As examples of crossing and twisting, we may cite the following passages:

CROSSING: ". . . Yo, querido pariente,
aunque mil vegadas caya,
y el bueytre se me vaya,
elijo Cesar o niente."

Gomez Manrique (1412-1490), *Cancionero castellano del siglo XV*, ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc, (Madrid, 1915), II, 123. (Mas quiero asno que me lleve que caballo que me derrueque. Mas vale pajaro en mano que buitre volando. O Cesar o nada.)

TWISTING: "No tiene el vino sino una tacha, que lo bueno vale caro y lo malo hace daño; asi que con lo que sana el higado, enferma la bolsa." *Celestina*, sc. IX. (Lo bueno vale caro y lo malo hace daño. Con lo que sana el higado enferma el bazo).

[14] See, for example: "Je tueroys un pigne pour un mercier." *Gargantua*, xxxiii.

on the other hand, has a number of examples of this typical Renaissance sport.[15]

Analysis of these devices illustrates the expert stylistic use which may be made of the proverb. Many examples from Spanish literature, especially those taken from the *Corbacho* and the *Celestina*, also show the importance of the proverb as a factor in the development of character. The author, in commenting on his characters, or, to an even greater extent, the character himself, finds in the proverb an eminently personal means of expression. He may, of course, quote it to great advantage even in the purely formal mediaeval manner, as we see in Chaucer and Juan Ruiz. Obviously, the effect is enhanced by the more sophisticated usage of the Renaissance. The *Celestina* has a number of examples as striking as the following one. Calisto's servant remarks sardonically on his master's enjoyment of the pleasures of love, on the very day his faithful intermediaries have died in his service: "Para con tal joya quien quiera ternia manos; pero con su pan se lo coma, que bien caro le cuesta; dos mozos entraron en la salsa de estos amores" (sc. XIV). Here, "con su pan se lo coma" suggests the lover's "sweet dish," with its costly "sauce" ("Mas cuesta el salmorejo que el conejo"); there is a double suggestion, of word and of idea. It is possible, of course, for one proverb to attract another in which a similar idea is conveyed by a quite different metaphor. In this case, both idea and metaphor are repeated.

In Sancho Panza's conversation this technique is perfected. The following example would be hard to match anywhere:

> Y si vuestra altanería no quisiere que se me dé el prometido gobierno, de menos me hizo Dios, y podría ser que el no dármelo redundase en pro de mi conciencia; que maguera tonto, se me entiende aquel refrán de: por su mal le nacieron alas a la hormiga; y aun podría ser que se fuese mas aína Sancho escudero al cielo que no Sancho gobernador. Tan buen pan hacen aquí como en Francia; y de noche todos los gatos son pardos; y asaz de desdichada es la persona que a las dos de la tarde no se ha desayunado; y no hay estómago que sea un palmo mayor que otro; el cual se puede llenar, como suele decirse, de paja y heno; y las avecitas del campo tienen a Dios por su proveedor y despensero; y más calientan cuatro varas de paño de Cuenca que otras cuatro de límiste de Segovia . . . y torno a decir que si vuesa señoría no me quisiere dar la ínsula por tonto, yo sabré no dárseme nada por discreto; y yo he oído que detrás de la cruz está el diablo, y no es oro todo lo que reluce . . . [II, xxxiii].

In this passage we follow Sancho's thought, in ten proverbs, through

[15] The following passage is perhaps the most skillful in Cervantes:

"—Pues ¿cómo? — repitió Don Quijote — ¿por músicos y cantores van también a galeras?

"—Sí, señor—respondió el galeote—que no hay peor cosa que cantar en el ansia.

"—Antes he yo oído decir—dijo Don Quijote—que quien canta, sus males espanta.

"—Acá es al revés—dijo el galeote—; que quien canta una vez llora toda la vida." *Don Quijote*, I, 22.

these various stages: (1) I submit to my fate. (2) That was too good for me. (3) There are other good things left in life. (4) Maybe they are worth more than the chance I missed. (5) Everything is all right as long as one has three squares a day. (6) All stomachs are the same size —that is, the rich man doesn't enjoy eating any more than the poor man. (7) The poor man, furthermore, can eat anything. (8) And God looks after the poor. (9) The rude fare of the poor man is more heart-warming. (10) "Sour grapes"—appearances are deceitful.

Although all the proverbs are quoted complete, they are so at one with Sancho's "stream of consciousness" that we do not see in them at all the decorative "little gems" of Erasmus, but rather an inseparable part of Sancho's thought.

In comparison with this psychological sketch of Sancho Panza, the only example I have found in Rabelais is quite pale:

> Je vous demande en demandant
> comme le roy a son sargent
> et la Royne a son enfant,

says Frère Jean (IV, 7) who seems to have started speaking without any intention of quoting the whole proverbial jingle, and to have been drawn into it in spite of himself.

In dialogue also, we find the proverb used as a psychological resource. The phenomenon appears in Spain with the *Celestina.* Sempronio says to his master: "Si tu pides que se concluya en un dia lo que en un año seria harto, no es mucha tu vida." And Calisto replies: "Que, quieres decir que soy como el mozo del escudero gallego?" (sc. VIII). This passage alludes to the proverb: "El mozo del escudero gallego, que andaba todo el año descalzo y por un dia queria matar al zapatero" (Correas, 177). Here we find in perfect harmony adaptation, allusion, and a psychological development which present us with the allusion not only made, but understood, and converted into the motivating force of the dialogue.

Rabelais uses this device too, though on another level. His examples show more virtuosity than naturalness. ". . . Luy dist: 'Grand mercy, bonne mine. — Mais, dist elle, tres grand a vous, mauvais jeu. — De bonne mine, dist Pantagruel, a mauvais jeu n'est alliance impertinente' " (IV, 9). This is a quite superficial battle of wits on the level of badinage—again, the satirical mechanization of the Breughel figures—rather than an intelligent understanding of subtle implications between two interlocutors. Pantagruel, it may be noted, even has to explain the joke.

Finally, we may cite a passage which summarizes all that we have said of Cervantes' subtle use of proverbs to express his best ideas. Don Quijote is censuring Sancho for his constant use of proverbs:

Yo te aseguro que estos refranes te han de llevar un día a la horca . . . —¡ Por Dios, señor nuestro amo—replicó Sancho—que vuesa merced se queja de bien pocas cosas! ¡ A qué diablos se pudre de que yo me sirva de mi hacienda, que ninguna otra tengo, ni otro caudal alguno, sino refranes y más refranes! Y ahora se me ofrecen cuatro que venían aquí pintiparados, o como peras en tabaque; pero no los diré porque al buen callar llaman Sancho.

—Ese Sancho no eres tu—dijo Don Quijote—;porque no sólo no eres buen callar, sino mal hablar y mal porfiar; y, con todo eso, querría saber qué cuatro refranes te ocurrían ahora a la memoria que venían aquí a propósito; que yo ando recorriendo la mía, que la tengo buena, y ninguno se me ofrece . . . [II, 43].

Comment on this passage seems superfluous.

Returning to the remarks of Sainéan which gave rise to this comparison, we may say that, judged from a fresh point of view, Rabelais, like Breughel, appears as no more than a good imitator of the mediaeval paroemiologists, while Cervantes is seen to perfect the exploitation of the stylistic and psychological resources of the proverb which characterizes the Spanish Renaissance. In comparison with the casual ease of Cervantes, Rabelais' ingenious chapters in proverbs seem nothing but awkward *tours de force,* paralleled elsewhere in Europe at an earlier date.

In this brief survey, we have seen at its source and at different stages of its development the abundant stream of literary proverbs in Spain—a stream which was not dried up at the advent of the Renaissance, but was constantly enriched and broadened throughout the century of the revival of the classics. Although I am not prepared to offer comparable documentation for France, my general conclusions would still hold, even though better examples than those I have found should be discovered among French writers of the Middle Ages. For Rabelais is the French popular genius *par excellence.* If a continuous tradition of the stylized proverb had existed in French, we may be sure that his critical spirit would have known how to make as good use of it as did Cervantes of his own national legacy. And, if Cervantes is the superior artist, we may say with certainty that his mastery would have been impossible without that long tradition of the cultivation of all things popular for their own sake which bequeathed its special quality to the Spanish Renaissance.

Hollins College

BOOK REVIEWS

MUSIC AND LITERATURE, A COMPARISON OF THE ARTS. By Calvin S. Brown. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1948. 287 p.

"This book was written with the hope that it might open up a field of thought which has not yet been systematically explored . . . there has been no survey of the entire field. This book attempts to supply such a survey" (Preface).

The author's approach and method are reflected in his chapter headings: Science and Art; The Fine Arts; Rhythm and Pitch; Timbre, Harmony, and Counterpoint; Vocal Music: General Considerations; The Literal Setting of Vocal Music; The Dramatic Setting of Vocal Music; The Dilemma of Opera; Repetition and Variation; Balance and Contrast; Theme and Variations; ABA Form and the Rondo; The Fugue; Sonata Form; The Musical Development of Symbols: Whitman; The Poetry of Conrad Aiken; Fiction and the Leitmotiv; Literary Types in Music; Program Music: a Short Guide to the Battlefield; Descriptive Music; Narrative Music.

Calvin Brown has been working in this field for many years, his dissertation on *The Musical Opus in Poetry* having been completed at Wisconsin in 1934. His extensive bibliographical references (fellow-workers will be disappointed by the lack of a systematic bibliography) show that he has made a wide sweep through the pertinent literature of his subject. These readings and his own studies have been thoroughly digested in preparation for the chapters of this book, and his findings are supported by copious, apt, and seemingly quite comprehensive citations from various literatures, with searching and illuminating analyses. (In view of the well-known musical attributes of the Chinese language, it would seem that no final conclusions can be drawn until that section of the total field has been surveyed.)

It is with something like authority, therefore, at least as regards the Occidental languages and literatures, that the Conclusion makes the following points: " . . . music and literature have many points in common, and . . . essential differences which no attempts at imitation of one by the other have been able to overcome . . . the essential difference is . . .: the sounds out of which the literary work is constructed must have an external significance, and those used in music require no such meaning . . . the general course of instrumental music has been from pure formal abstraction, through formal patterns . . . to the illustration of objects and stories . . . the general course of literature seems to have been . . . from the literal and concrete to the abstract . . . it will follow that music and literature have started out as opposites and each has set as the goal of its own development the starting point of the other. . . . As far as concreteness and abstraction are concerned, the two arts have started from opposite extremes and have both ultimately taken a middle-ground of compromise. The great difference is that all literature of any value is based on this compromise . . . The greatest instrumental music . . . has for its main concern the patterns themselves . . . The balance between pattern and representation, then, is not so complete in music as in literature . . . Is it not possible, then, that music simply has not yet had sufficient time to develop

its capacities for the expression of things outside itself? . . . it would seem that music, by its very nature, differs from literature in this respect . . ."

I have quoted at some length, first, because these formulations, phrased with the precision and clarity which mark the book as a whole, set forth the gist of Brown's views more concisely and effectively than I could summarize them; and, second, because I wish to suggest in this way that I am in substantial agreement with his main theses, and am in the main convinced by his arguments and illustrations. It is a pleasure to add that his felicitous style and his genial humor help to make his work highly entertaining as well as instructive. Occasionally there is even a brilliant *bon mot*, as in his allusion to a *seductio ad absurdum* in Huxley's *Point Counter Point* (p. 210), or his summing up of the musical progress of Richard Strauss in the statement (p. 228) that he "stalked into the field of program music blowing the clarion of freedom and marched out to a double fugue."

But, while I am in full sympathy with Brown's general approach to his subject, there are details on which I disagree with him, or as to which I think his presentation might be augmented or altered. I shall take these up in the order of their occurrence.

Page 17. The time scheme of classical Greek and Latin poetry was based on the length not of vowels but of syllables.

Page 18. The discussion of rhythmical patterns in poetry and music is blurred by the failure to take two important factors into account. First, although we classify the "feet" in English verse for the sake of convenience, the line of poetry when read breaks down into rhythmical units, not feet. Second, since modern music is written in "bars," with the first note in the bar normally carrying an accent, themes or melodies which do not begin with the bar line will have an "iambic" or "anapaestic" opening but a "trochaic" or "dactylic" beat. These two facts reduce considerably the area of rhythmical correspondence between verse and music.—Also, while the spondee and the pyrrhic may not be "basic units" in the sense that entire passages are made up of them, the pyrrhic is a standard variant of the trochee, and the spondee of the dactyl. The example from Masefield quoted on p. 23, "the wheel's kick and the wind's song and the white sail's shaking," shows an effective use of spondaic rhythm.

Page 19. The printing of an iambic passage from Tennyson as trochaic proves to me, contrary to Brown's assertion, that the thing can *not* be done, the reason being that the rhythmic patterns of the original are not mechanically or artificially iambic, but basically so, i.e., written so as to be iambic and nothing else. Observe that of Tennyson's ten lines nine end with a comma or period; every one of the "trochaic" lines ends with a word which is violently severed from the following one. This leads to the frustration of the reader, who is wont to terminate each line of verse with a pause which, however slight, is commonly organic.

Page 20. If Longfellow's hexameter—or any other English hexameter—is actually read so that the accented syllable occupies the same amount of time as two unaccented ones, the result is singsong, chant, a kind of music, no longer spoken verse.

Page 21. It is erroneous to speak of "the dropping of an accent" in any regular pattern of verse, or to say that "pentameters tend to have only four real accents to the line." This confuses recitation with metrics. It is of the essence of a metrical pattern that a mental attitude is produced which I call "expectation," the result of which is that, for example, "To be, or not to be:

that is the question" gets its full quota of five accents or stresses, despite the weakness of at least two of them.

Page 30. In saying "no one claims that the pitch relationships of speech are... consistent," Brown has overlooked a significant little study, published some years ago in *PMLA*, in which two scholars reported the result of an inquiry into the relation or rhyme and music. Using modern recording apparatus, the writers proved that a rhyme word repeats the pitch of its predecessor, quite without any awareness on the part of the reader. This bore out my own investigation of the West Germanic alliterative verse, in which I showed that the "double alliteration" of the first half-line is commonly accompanied by equality of pitch. We have largely lost the power of hearing the pitch relationships of speech (except when we hear the "singing" in the speech of other peoples), but the relationships exist, and some day perhaps they will be rediscovered.

Page 32. I must dissent from the statement that "singing is merely a form of speech." The reader can determine for himself that this is not so. Let him "intone" the first verse of *Evangeline* as indicated by the second notation on page 20; he will get sing-song, but not singing.

Page 38. French readers will not agree with the statement that "the line as a metrical unit alone can hardly exist" in French poetry, or that "the [French] language does not have syllabic stress." If this were true, there could be no *vers libre*. I invite the interested reader to take any two lines of good French poetry, substitute for any expression in them any other one of comparable meaning and equal syllabic count, and then read the two versions alternately; the result will be surprising.

Page 39. Note that "harmony" in music is not only applied to "simultaneously produced tones." The word is also used for running chords, e.g., in an accompaniment, and even for the cumulative effect of the notes in a melody. It is perfectly in order to speak of the "harmony" in a theme consisting of consecutive notes.

Page 40. While I agree that not much musical analogy attaches to the stage device of having more than one person speak at once, the technique itself is of far more frequent use than is indicated here. I have seen it brilliantly employed by Max Reinhardt with much more than farcical intent and result.

Page 83. In allowing the composer only "two principles in the relationship between his music and the text," Brown overlooks several possibilities which are actually utilized with great effectiveness in the master-songs of Schubert and others.

Page 87. The discussion of opera draws far too heavily on American folkways, particularly as exemplified in New York. Had Brown borne in mind the part played by opera in some of the European countries, he need not have overstressed the "society" element in opera-going.

Page 89. It is needless exaggeration to say that "every gesture, every step, every bit of stage business [in opera] has become absolutely stereotyped." Here too European practice would offer a corrective.

Page 104. In his discussion of the types of repetition commanded by poetry, Brown ignores the most important one of all—the repetition of line length. Anyone who has dabbled in verse writing knows that the emotional quality of the trimeter, tetrameter, pentameter, and so on, is something fixed and inescapable.

Page 126. Brown challenges "the popular differentiation of major as gay and minor as sad," and it is true that in instrumental music gaiety and a minor key are quite compatible (Mendelssohn's *"Italian" Symphony* is a case

in point). Less frequent, I believe, is the attempt to express sadness by means of a major key. But in vocal music I find a fairly clear differentiation, and I would invite the reader to analyze Schubert's setting of "Der Lindenbaum" from this point of view.

Page 208. In an article published in the first issue of *Symposium* on "The Novelette as a Literary Form," I presented evidence which should lead to a modification of the assertion that the novelette "has never been a widely cultivated form in the English-speaking countries." In the same article, I believe I threw considerable doubt on the statement (p. 220) that "the difference between the novelette and the novel is primarily one of length."

Page 209. It seems to me that, in comparing Lamb's essay on roast pig with much of the writing about music, Brown forgets what he makes much of elsewhere, namely, the fundamental kinship between music and literature. No such kinship exists between cookery and either literature or music. In general, I feel that Brown does not pay sufficient attention to two phases of the influence of music on literature: first, verbal descriptions of music and musical effects (examples come to my mind in a flood); and, second, writing which is more or less consciously and deliberately "lyrical," i.e., melodious, emotional, and intent on evoking in the reader a response akin to that aroused by music. Ever since the Romantic Period literature has been full of this. In the same connection I might mention "Die Maringotte," by Max Krell, in which a conscious attempt is made, in an expressionistic way, to imitate the rhythmic patterns of the dance; it is on the whole an extraordinary performance, which shows what can be achieved with words.

On the same page, Brown refers to the idea of having an author figure as a character in his own book, and ascribes it to Gide. This conceit may be older than the Romantic Period, but it certainly occurs there. In Brentano's *Godwi* (1801-02) the hero points out to the author a pond with the words, "This is the pond into which I fall on page 266 of the first volume." Paul Ernst also introduced himself by name in his story cycle, *Die Hochzeit*.

In conclusion, I append a number of minor errors which should be corrected in a subsequent edition. Pages 84-85, write *Flaischlen* for *Flaischeln;* also in the notes. Pages 87, 232, I am sorry to see a professor of English write "in terms of" something that has no terms. Page 97, *dramatist* for *dramatists.* Page 103, *principal* for *principle.* Page 118, comma after *obligatory.* Page 129, *entr'actes* for *entreacts.* Page 130, *known* for *know.* Page 138, I deplore "poetry would not stand for," and I don't think "The poem . . . is a good evidence of this difficulty." Page 140, in "Der Tod und das Mädchen" there is no evidence that Death appears as "deliverer." Page 141, this is the third time that we are told, almost in the same words, that poetry allows much less repetition than music. Page 146, *Calverley* for *Calverly.* Page 207, *succeeded further* for *succeeded farther;* to me *farther* is a spatial term. Page 213, Tonio Kröger's mother is not Italian; she probably came from Brazil, like Thomas Mann's own mother. Page 224, *Stücke* for *Stücken.* Page 253, *little* for *litle.* Page 265, *cacophony* for *cacaphony.*

BAYARD Q. MORGAN

Stanford, Calif.

AN ESSAY ON THE VITA NUOVA. By Charles S. Singleton. Cambridge, Mass.: Published for the Dante Society by the Harvard University Press, 1949. 168 p.

This small volume on the *Vita Nuova* may well serve as a model for mediaeval studies, since, in an almost exemplary way, it avoids imposing upon mediaeval

matters our modern approaches and problems. It submits faithfully to, and takes seriously, the traditions of mediaeval art and the way in which the mediaeval poet viewed his task.

Its leading ideas are the following. Beatrice was a living creature of flesh and blood who was a miracle. The miracle is finally revealed by her death, which seems to offer analogies to the death of Christ. Even during her life such analogies to Christ appeared. The poet who tells the story finds it in the Book of Memory, as he says in the proem. Finding it there, *now* that Beatrice is dead, he knows what had happened and what it meant; but as a protagonist in the story, *then*, he did not know what was going to happen and what it meant; he very often failed to understand fully the prophetic visions and dreams which occurred to him. Thus, a *then* and a *now* are established for the whole action. Furthermore, copying from the Book of Memory, the poet is, in a strict sense, not the author of the story, although the book from which he copies is accessible only to him; for it contains experience of events of which God, unfolding the events of time, was the author. In his memory the poet also finds poems of which he himself was the author; he adds to the poems divisions in order to "open" their meaning; sometimes he even adds comments to his narratives, e.g., on the marvelous virtue of Beatrice's greeting, or on the number nine. But the main part of his narrative is the report of his experience, of which God is the author; this "sober and solemn" prose demonstrates the unity, objectivity, and veracity of his supernatural experience. It is reality, not metaphor. The *Vita Nuova*, with Beatrice as its center, is a little world, analogous to the great world of human history of which Christ is the center. As for its content, the experience is an ascent from the love of a woman to the love of God, from Love to Caritas. It is marked at first by the disappearance of *Amore* after his declaration that "whoever should consider subtly, would call Beatrice *Amore*, because of the great resemblance which she has to me"; and later by Beatrice's death and the *excessus mentis* of the last sonnet ("Oltre la spera"). There are three stages in the development of Dante's love. In the first place, he hopes for a reward —her greeting—as the troubadours did. In the second, when the greeting is denied to him, he finds satisfaction in her praise; this, already, is a disinterested love, even though it is still love in this life, and love of a woman. These two stages are within the tradition of mediaeval love poetry. But the third one, the love after Beatrice's death, is not a theme established by this tradition. The object of love, Beatrice, returns to Heaven whence she came; the sigh which follows her becomes a *trasumanar*; she becomes *la gloriosa donna della mia mente*. The three stages of this ascent can be compared to the stages of the mystic ascent; *extra nos, intra nos, supra nos.*

Thus, the main features stressed by Professor Singleton are the prose and the motive of Beatrice's death. They are, in my opinion also, the most important points for any critic who wishes to demonstrate the difference between the *Vita Nuova* and the earlier tradition of love poetry. Furthermore, his conception of Beatrice as a living creature who was a miracle, if it finally succeeds in being understood, should put an end to the absurd struggle between realists and allegorists.

There are several points, however, where Singleton seems to go too far in pursuing his ideas. Although I am in accord with his conception that the Book of Memory has been "written by God," I cannot agree with the argument taken from chap. XXV (p. 29). He says that, since in this chapter Dante admits personifications only in poetry, not in prose, and since, nevertheless, Amore appears as a person also in the preceding prose, the author of the poems, Dante, is not the author of the prose. But, in the prose, Amore is not introduced as a person acting in real events; he only appears in dreams, visions, and imaginations. That needs no

explanation or excuse, as it seems to me. Singleton's conception of God writing history, and therefore the Book of Memory, does not need this kind of proof.

Furthermore, although I, too, consider the death of Beatrice as the decisive event in the development from Love to Caritas, I believe that Singleton underestimates the importance of Guinicelli in preparing this development. There is, in my opinion, no ambiguity at the end of his canzone "Al cor gentil" (p. 70). When, in this passage, Guinicelli is asked by God why he placed all his love in an earthly creature, he answers:

> "Dir li potrò: tenea d'angel sembianza,
> Che fosse del tu' regno;
> Non me fo fallo s' eo li posi amanza."

The words *dir li potrò* and *non me fo fallo* indicate, as it seems to me, that he considers his words as a sufficient reply. As for Singleton's comment on the Bonagiunta passage, *Purgatorio* XXIV (pp. 92-93), it is certainly true that the poem "Donne ch'avete" is singled out as a representative work of the Dolce Stil Nuovo, and that, in fact, it has an important place in Dante's development from Love to Charity. It may even be true that "Bonagiunta seems now to understand all this," at his place in Purgatorio; it is, in any case, a very suggestive observation. But, if Singleton wants to imply that Dante considered the canzone "Donne ch'avete" as the beginning of the New Style, and that all earlier poets were "on the other side of the knot," that seems to me very difficult to believe. Bonagiunta names il Notaro and Guittone and himself as those who were "di qua dal dolce stil novo ch'io odo." Dante would never have thought to include among those men Guinicelli,

> il padre
> Mio e degli altri miei miglior che mai
> Rime d'amor usar dolci e leggiadri.
> (*Purg.*, XXVI, 97-99).

But such problems are of importance to specialists only; they should not divert our attention from the outstanding merits of this essay—the clarity and the purity of the author's approach to mediaeval conceptions.

ERICH AUERBACH

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN AUTHORS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN LITERATURE. By Olga Peragallo. Edited by Anita Peragallo, with a Preface by Giuseppe Prezzolini. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1949. 242 p.

Though this is a book of a somewhat limited importance in the vast field of comparative literature, it is certainly a labor of love. Miss Peragallo loyally dwelt on whatever literary merits she could find among the fifty-nine Italo-Americans discussed in this annotated bibliography; her notes, after her premature death, were completed and prepared for the printer by her mother and her brother. The study is restricted to Italians and their descendants who were either born or at least educated in the United States—which means that other writers from Lorenzo da Ponte to Giuseppe Borgese had to be eliminated. Every literary figure is briefly evaluated under four different headings: (1) the Biography shows more often than not against what heartbreaking odds a poor Italian immigrant family had to struggle before a few of its members could achieve for themselves a moderate

amount of happiness and success. (2) The Bibliography enumerates novels, poems, dramas, essays, translations, or newspaper articles in English or Italian. (3) The Comments quote or interpret whatever book reviewers, publishers, or friends had to say about the author. (4) The Sources indicate mostly a personal appraisal by the author or data based on *Who's Who*.

Less than a dozen among the fifty-nine writers discussed are nationally known or appreciated: Sacco and Vanzetti, two of the most tragic and controversial figures of our century; Fiorello H. La Guardia and Edoardo Corsi, political leaders and reformers; Angelo Patri, the educator; Paul Gallico and Frank Gervasi, newspapermen; Bernard DeVoto, the critic; acclaimed authors like Hamilton Basso (*Beauregard*, 1933), Mrs. Francesca Vinciguerra, alias Frances Winwar (*The Romantic Rebels*, 1935), and Pietro di Donato (*Christ in Concrete*, 1939); translators like Mrs. A. M. Ascoli; showmen like Jimmy Savo; and others. Many of these others, however, should not have been included, even though some of them could "trace the family tree back to the Etruscans" and though their aristocratic ancestors may have been important figures in the unification of Italy, "according to a press notice in a Chicago newspaper a number of years ago." Well-wishers of Italian achievements at home and abroad will welcome this informative bibliography published in the rather unattractive format of S. F. Vanni; but it must be admitted that the contribution of most of these authors to American literature proper were rather small, even though they dealt, as few others could, with important and tragic aspects of the American melting pot.

W.P.F.

THE CLASSICAL TRADITION. By Gilbert Highet. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1949. xxxviii, 763 p.

The purpose of *The Classical Tradition* is well indicated in the first sentence of the Preface: "This book is an outline of the chief ways in which Greek and Latin influence has moulded the literatures of western Europe and America." This statement, however, hardly prepares one for the masterly and elegant way in which Highet has performed his task. After a very useful analytical Table of Contents (itself an "outline" of the book's materials), Highet presents a series of twenty-four chapters on the inspiration which the classics have given Western man from the Dark Ages down to our own time. It is a long and glorious story, and Highet has told it superlatively well. The very first chapter, with its summary of the subject from the fall of ancient civilization to the Renaissance, is so fresh and stimulating that, even if one were not interested to begin with, one might well be fascinated after this introduction.

While the general plan of the rest of the book is chronological, Highet gives a pleasant variety to his work by concentrating our attention now on one sort of thing, now on another. We traverse the various periods of literature: the Dark Ages, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the baroque era, the revolutionary ("romantic") period, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. We fix our eye now on this land, now on that: England in the Dark Ages, mediaeval France, the Italy of Dante and of Petrarch and Boccaccio, Germany in her belated eighteenth-century renaissance. The great giants of literature have long sections to themselves, and Dante and Shakespeare are allotted chapters. The various literary types—drama, epic, pastoral, romance, lyric, satire, fiction, history—all have their moments on the center of the stage. Certain significant movements in literary history are set before us: the translations of the Renaissance, the battle of the books in the

seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the classical scholarship of the last hundred years, contemporary reinterpretations of classical mythology. Throughout it all there is no chapter, no section—in fact, there is scarcely a page—which is not rich in information and ideas.

In such a varied treasure house it is not only difficult, it seems almost impertinent, to select specific points for comment or praise. The classicist will perhaps note with especial enthusiasm Highet's skill in demonstrating the absurdity of some popular anticlassical fallacies. It is good for the modern world to be reminded of such things as these: Literature and art are not fossils but are able to inspire and to reproduce. "In civilization as in human life, the present is the child of the past. Only, in the life of the spirit, it is permitted to select our ancestors, and to choose the best" (pp. 1 and 2). Languages are meant for writing as well as speaking, so that Greek and Latin cannot reasonably be called dead languages when the books written in them have continued to speak so effectively to so many of the great creative minds of the postclassical world and are so speaking in our own day. "... Greek and Latin are not dead languages so long as their literatures are living carriers of energy, and thought, and stimulus, to scholars and poets" (p. 70). "The only dead languages are those which no one now either speaks or reads, like Etruscan and Cretan" (p. 544). Highet makes it clear that Shakespeare's small Latin and less Greek would in a poet of these degenerate days seem almost like vast classical learning. There is a strong and welcome insistence on the influence of Greece and Rome on the "romantic" period, and we are repeatedly reminded of the sound classical training of many of the greatest "romantic" writers and of their abiding interest in ancient, especially in Greek, literature.

Not the least amazing feature of the book is the way in which Highet has so consistently managed to strike just the right level in his treatment of this long and complex theme. It would have been so easy to be too learned or too elementary. But Highet neither bores the specialist by expatiating on the familiar nor bewilders the uninitiated by allusive erudition. Since a great many of the readers of this book are likely to be specialists in some of its many fields and since nearly, if not quite, all of its readers will be novices in many of its fields, this remarkable virtue is as important as it is welcome. One place where the specialist might feel that Highet becomes too elementary for too long is, curiously, the section dealing with a topic which is really outside the proper scope of his book, the Anglo-Saxon epic. An almost solitary instance of cryptic learning is "the thirteen books of the *Aeneid*" on p. 115. This might well puzzle readers who knew something of the *Aeneid* but were not aware that for nearly two hundred years after 1471 Maphaeus Vegius' sequel was commonly published with it.

Those who so persistently urge that more time should be spent in our colleges and universities on the study of American literature should be a bit chagrined to see how small a part it plays in this survey of the literature of the Western world, and still more chagrined to realize that probably no fair critic could have justly given it a larger place.

For the benefit of those not already acquainted with Highet's earlier work it may be said that the style of the book is wholly admirable: lucid, remarkably varied in dealing with recurrent phenomena and with details, free from the loathsome jargon of so much contemporary writing on literature, and, when necessary, rising to real power and eloquence. (One phrase, I admit, bothers me. Fénelon's *Telemachus* is said to have been "an unconscious ancestor of Joyce's *Ulysses*" [p. 338]. I do not know what an unconscious ancestor is.)

On the other side of the ledger I find only one serious fault. The footnotes are most lamentably banished to the back of the book—lamentably, because no footnote put in such a place deserves to be looked at, and yet these are definitely worth reading. In fact, so many of them are so good that most readers will probably ruin their tempers by reading the book in two places at once. Greater worth than this hath no footnote. But no author has a right to require this of a reader. It is just possible that there is something sound to be said for the policy of putting bibliographical references where the sight of them will not pain the tender eyes of the dainty. But the footnotes in Highet's book are not exclusively, or even mainly, mere citations such as these. Many are highly interesting and valuable discussions sometimes more than a page in length. But there is no way of knowing before we take the trouble to turn to another part of the forest whether we shall find there something like an excursus on ancient attempts to correct Homer's version of the Trojan War, some illustrations of Lincoln's debt to ancient rhetoric, or something like "Beowulf 1063-1159." This is bad enough when one is reading straight through and must turn back and forth at nearly every page; it becomes maddening when one is reading an isolated section and must then find the particular "footnote four" in the maze of twenty-four "footnotes four" for twenty-four chapters. The footnotes cover 150 pages. Since they are in small type, they may well be a third as long as the body of the book. They are too copious as well as too good to bury. If this arrangement was selected by the publisher as a means of cutting costs, then in this respect the book is unworthy of the scholarly traditions of the Oxford University Press. It appears possible, however, from the approval with which Highet cites an *obiter dictum* from Norwood's *Pindar*, that Highet himself looks upon footnotes at the bottom of the page as a repulsive open sewer (p. 695). Why one who feels this way about footnotes should want to put them into his book at all, I cannot imagine. I have tarried on this point not so much because of the irritation this feature of this book has caused me as because it exemplifies a pernicious trend in scholarly printing. *Speculum* has recently fallen and now masses its notes at the ends of articles.

Inevitably in a work covering so wide a field, some slips will occur and some statements will be made which will not be accepted everywhere. It is not quite accurate to say that Étienne Dolet was burned because of a detail in his version of Plato's *Axiochus* (p. 181). However much this may have contributed to his condemnation, Dolet's offences were more numerous than mistranslating Plato. In connection with Homer's famous pair of similes comparing Aias retreating from the Τρῶες, first to a lion and then to an ass refusing to leave a grain field for all the beating he gets (*Iliad* 11, 548 ff.), Highet tells us, "What Homer meant . . . was that Ajax was as brave as a lion and as stupid as a donkey, and that his bravery and his stupidity were closely connected aspects of his personality. This is comic. Homer meant it to be so" (p. 273). This is surely a quite erroneous interpretation. Homer does not mean to suggest here that Aias is stupid but rather that he is supremely stubborn. (Incidentally, the boys may have beaten the donkey "about the head" [p. 272], but Homer does not say they did.) And if there is no stupidity in Aias' conduct, there is nothing comic in the passage either. However, the question of what is comic in Homer is tantalizingly difficult, and scarcely any two readers are likely to agree on all possible instances. Some Platonists would doubtless object to the statement that the charges against Socrates included "atheism" (p. 423), and to the phrase "Socrates the stonemason" (p. 461). The discussion of the reasons for "the decline of public interest in classical studies" (pp. 490-500) seems to me to put far too much emphasis on the faults and errors of teachers

of the classics. Highet's point of view is, it is true, a fashionable one and is shared, for instance, by his Columbia colleague Barzun. The remark in the section on Housman that textual criticism is "ultimately a glorified form of proofreading" (p. 496) is clever but has only enough truth to be grossly misleading. It is nearly nasty enough, though, to be worthy of Housman himself. Chryseis and Briseis were not from the same town (p. 577, note 27), though they were from the same region and were both captured during the same campaign. There will unquestionably be some disagreement with Highet's estimates of some of the many writers he touches upon. I cannot myself, for example, believe that everyone will feel he has been sufficiently generous to Gibbon or sufficiently critical of Ezra Pound.

But these are all very minor faults, and the marvel is that there are so few. They do not affect the fundamental fact that this is a splendid book worthy of its splendid subject. In a time when nearly everything which is printed is likely to be described by somebody as stimulating and challenging, one is almost afraid to say that a book is inspiring lest it be thought faint praise or even an insult. But in a very real sense this is an inspiring book. It deals with literature, ancient and modern, from Homer to Robinson Jeffers, in such a way as to make one want to read the literatures of the Western world. I should be greatly surprised if it did not actually inspire a great deal of such reading. No book about books can have a higher value than this.

A book as excellent as this and with such a wide appeal will presumably be reprinted from time to time. It will not be amiss, then, to note a few insignificant misprints to be corrected:

Page 120, the dedication of Golding's translation of Seneca *On Benefits* is dated 1577, but the book was published in 1578. Page 290, for "Asam" read "Adam" (second item of left-hand column). Page 593, note 73, for "Ovid" read "Chaucer." Page 622, note 72, for "quoted" read e.g. "cited." Page 696, footnotes 2 and 3 should be reversed.

The almost faultless printing is a compliment to all the scholars and craftsmen who had a hand in the book's production.

FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK

University of Oregon

BOOKS RECEIVED

Andrews, Kenneth R. Nook Farm, Mark Twain's Hartford Circle. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950. xiv, 288 p.

Borland, Harriet. Soviet Literary Theory and Practice during the First Five-Year Plan 1928-32. New York: King's Crown Press, 1950. xii, 256 p.

Capocci, Valentina. Genio e mestiere: Shakespeare e la Commedia dell'arte. Bari: Laterza & figli, 1950. 129 p.

Cuervo, Rufino José. Disquisiciones sobre filología castellana. Edición, prólogo y notas de Rafael Torres Quintero. (Publicaciones del Instituto Caro y Cuervo, IV.) Bogotá, 1950. xvi, 666 p.

Figueiredo, F. de. A Epica portuguesa no seculo XVI. São Paulo, 1950. 406 p. (6th ed., published as Bull. CI of the University of São Paulo, Letras, No. 6.)

Figueiredo, F. de. Ultimas aventuras. Rio de Janeiro: Empresa a Noite, n.d. 391 p.

Holberg, Ludvig. Seven One-Act Plays by Holberg. Trans. by Henry Alexander, Introd. by Svend Kragh-Jacobsen. Princeton: Princeton University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1950. 205 p.

Howells, William Dean. Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes by Clara Marburg Kirk and Rudolf Kirk. New York: American Book Co., 1950. ccv, 394 p.

Kirby, Thomas A., and Henry Bosley Woolf (editors). Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1949. x, 382 p.

Loy, J. Robert. Diderot's Determined Fatalist: A Critical Appreciation of Jacques le fataliste. New York: King's Crown Press, 1950. xii, 234 p.

Sellery, George Clarke. The Renaissance, Its Nature and Origins. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950. xii, 296 p.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

We are pleased to call attention to the new Studies in Comparative Literature published by the University of North Carolina. The first volume is the Baldensperger-Friederich *Bibliography of Comparative Literature*. Communications concerning publication of monographs in this series should be addressed to the general editor, Professor W. P. Friederich, P. O. Box 775, Chapel Hill, N.C.

English Miscellany: A Symposium of Literature and the Arts is published annually by the British Council in Rome, under the editorship of Mario Praz, Ronald Bottrall, and Edwin Muir. It "aims chiefly at collecting critical opinions and research from international points of view," and will stress relations between England and the continent. Address contributions to Professor Mario Praz, Via Giulia 147, Rome.

The University of Leeds is making a special effort to foster the study of Anglo-French cultural relations, and has established a research fellowship attached to the Department of French. Address inquiries to Professor G. T. Clayton, The University, Leeds 2, England.